arXiv:0706.3872v1 [math.LO] 26 Jun 2007

Understanding preservation theorems: Chapter VI of *Proper and Improper Forcing*

Chaz Schlindwein
Department of Mathematics and Computing
Lander University
Greenwood, South Carolina 29649 USA
`cschlind@lander.edu`

February 1, 2008

Abstract

We present an exposition of Section VI.1 and most of Section VI.2 from Shelah's book *Proper and Improper Forcing*. These sections offer proofs of the preservation under countable support iteration of proper forcing of various properties, including proofs that ω^ω-bounding, the Sacks property, the Laver property, and the P-point property are preserved by countable support iteration of proper forcing.

1 Introduction

This paper is an exposition of some preservation theorems, due to Shelah [12, Chapter VI], for countable support iterations of proper forcing. These include the preservation of the ${}^{\omega}\omega$-bounding property, the Sacks and Laver properties, the P-point property, and some others. Generalizations to revised countable support iterations of semi-proper forcings or even certain non-semi-proper forcings are given in [13, Chapter VI] but we do not address these more general iterations. The results of [12, Section VI.2] overlap the results of [2] and [3], but the methods are dissimilar.

This is the third in a sequence of expository papers covering parts of Shelah's book, *Proper and Improper Forcing.* The earlier papers were [11], which covers sections 2 through 8 of [12, Chapter XI] and [9], which covers sections 2 and 3 of [12, Chapter XV]. Other papers by the author generalize certain other results in [12]; in no instance were we content to quote a result of Shelah without supplying a proof. Thus, [5] may be read, in part, as an exposition of [12, Sections V.6, IX.2, and IX.4]; [6] is, in part, an exposition of [12, Section V.8 and Theorem III.8.5]; and [7] includes as a special case an alternative proof of [12, Theorem III.8.6]. Also, [5] answers [12, Question IX.4.9(1)]; [6] answers a question implicit in [12, Section IX.4]; [10] answers another such question and also may be read, in part, as an exposition of the results of Eisworth and Shelah [1] that weaken the assumption "α-proper for every $\alpha < \omega_1$" used in [12, Section V.6]. Lastly, [8, Section 2] corrects some minor errors in [5].

2 Preservation of properness

The fact that properness is preserved under countable support iterations was proved by Shelah in 1978. The proof of this fact is the basis of all preservation theorems for countable support iterations.

Theorem 2.1 (Proper Iteration Lemma, Shelah). *Suppose* $\langle P_\eta : \eta \leq \kappa\rangle$ *is a countable support forcing iteration based on* $\langle \dot{Q}_\eta : \eta < \kappa\rangle$ *and for every* $\eta < \kappa$ *we have that* $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\eta}$ "$\dot{Q}_\eta$ is proper." *Suppose also that* $\alpha < \kappa$ *and* λ *is a sufficiently large regular cardinal and* N *is a countable elementary submodel of* H_λ *and* $\{P_\kappa, \alpha\} \in N$ *and* $p \in P_\alpha$ *is* N*-generic and* $p \Vdash$ "$q \in P_{\alpha,\kappa} \cap N[G_{P_\alpha}]$." *Then there is* $r \in P_\kappa$ *such that* r *is* N*-generic and* $r{\restriction}\alpha = p$ *and* $p \Vdash$ "$r{\restriction}[\alpha,\kappa) \leq q$."

Proof. The proof proceeds by induction, so suppose that the Theorem holds for all iterations of length less than κ. Fix λ a sufficiently large regular cardinal, and fix N a countable elementary substructure of H_λ such that $P_\kappa \in N$ and fix also $\alpha \in \kappa \cap N$ and $p \in P_\alpha$ and a P_α-name q such that p is N-generic and $p \Vdash$ "$q \in P_{\alpha,\kappa} \cap N[G_{P_\alpha}]$."

Case 1. $\kappa = \beta + 1$ for some β.

Because $\beta \in N$ we may use the induction hypothesis to fix $p' \in P_\beta$ such that $p' \restriction \alpha = p$ and p' is N-generic and $p \Vdash$ "$p' \leq q \restriction \beta$." We have that $p' \Vdash$ "$q(\beta) \in N[G_{P_\beta}]$." Take $r \in P_\kappa$ such that $r \restriction \beta = p'$ and

$$p' \Vdash \text{"}r(\beta) \leq q(\beta) \text{ and } r(\beta) \text{ is } N[G_{P_\beta}]\text{-generic for } Q_\beta.\text{"}$$

Then r is N-generic and we are done with the successor case.

Case 2. κ is a limit ordinal.

Let $\beta = \sup(\kappa \cap N)$, and fix $\langle \alpha_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ an increasing sequence from $\kappa \cap N$ cofinal in β such that $\alpha_0 = \alpha$. Let $\langle \sigma_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ enumerate all the P_κ names $\sigma \in N$ such that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash$ "σ is an ordinal."

Using the induction hypothesis, build a sequence $\langle \langle p_n, q_n \rangle : n \in \omega \rangle$ such that $p_0 = p$ and $q_0 = q$ and for each $n \in \omega$ we have all of the following:

(1) $p_n \in P_{\alpha_n}$ and p_n is N-generic and $p_{n+1} \restriction \alpha_n = p_n$.

(2) $p_n \Vdash$ "$q_n \in P_{\alpha_n,\kappa} \cap N[G_{P_{\alpha_n}}]$ and if $n > 0$ then $q_n \leq q_{n-1} \restriction [\alpha_n, \kappa)$ and $q_n \Vdash$ '$\sigma_{n-1} \in N[G_{P_{\alpha_n}}]$.' "

(3) $p_n \Vdash$ "$p_{n+1} \restriction [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}) \leq q_n \restriction \alpha_{n+1}$."

Define $r \in P_\kappa$ such that $(\forall n \in \omega)(r \restriction \alpha_n = p_n)$ and $\operatorname{supp}(r) \subseteq \beta$. To see that r is N-generic, suppose that $\sigma \in N$ is a P_κ-name for an ordinal. Fix n such that $\sigma = \sigma_n$. Because p_{n+1} is N-generic, we have

$$p_{n+1} \Vdash \text{"supp}(q_{n+1}) \subseteq \kappa \cap N[G_{P_{\alpha_{n+1}}}] = \kappa \cap N,\text{"}$$

whence it is clear that

$$p_{n+1} \Vdash \text{"}r \restriction [\alpha_{n+1}, \kappa) \leq q_{n+1}.\text{"}$$

We have

$$p_{n+1} \Vdash \text{"}q_{n+1} \Vdash \text{'}\sigma \in Ord \cap N[G_{P_{\alpha_{n+1}}}] = Ord \cap N,\text{' "}$$

where Ord is the class of all ordinals. Thus $r \Vdash$ "$\sigma \in N$." We conclude that r is N-generic, and the Theorem is established.

Corollary 2.2 (Fundamental Theorem of Proper Forcing, Shelah). *Suppose* $\langle P_\eta : \eta \leq \kappa \rangle$ *is a countable support forcing iteration based on* $\langle Q_\eta : \eta < \kappa \rangle$ *and for every* $\eta < \kappa$ *we have that* $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\eta}$ "Q_η is proper." *Then* P_κ *is proper.*

Proof: Take $\alpha = 0$ in the Proper Iteration Lemma.

3 Preservation of proper plus ω^ω-bounding

In this section we recount Shelah's proof of the preservation of "proper plus ω^ω-bounding." This is a special case of [12, Theorem VI.1.12]. Another treatment of this result can be found in [2] and [3], using different methods.

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose* $\langle P_\eta : \eta \leq \kappa \rangle$ *is a countable support iteration based on* $\langle Q_\eta : \eta < \kappa \rangle$ *and each* Q_η *is proper in* $V[G_{P_\eta}]$. *Suppose* $\mathrm{cf}(\kappa) = \omega$ *and* $\langle \alpha_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ *is an increasing sequence of ordinals cofinal in* κ *with* $\alpha_0 = 0$. *Suppose also that* f *is a* P_κ*-name for an element of* ${}^\omega\omega$, *and suppose* $p \in P_\kappa$. *Then there are* $\langle p_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ *and* $\langle f_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ *such that* $p_0 \leq p$ *and for every* $n \in \omega$ *we have that each of the following holds:*

(1) For all $k \leq n$ we have $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_{\alpha_n}}$ "$p_0 \restriction [\alpha_n, \kappa) \Vdash$ '$f(k) = f_n(k)$,'" and

(2) f_n is a P_{α_n}-name for an element of ${}^\omega\omega$, and

(3) $p_0 \restriction \alpha_n \Vdash$ "$p_0 \restriction [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}) \Vdash$ '$f_n(k) = f_{n+1}(k)$ for every $k \leq n+1$,'" and

(4) $p_{n+1} \leq p_n$, and

(5) whenever $k \leq m < \omega$ we have $p_0 \restriction \alpha_n \Vdash$ "$p_m \restriction [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}) \Vdash$ '$f_n(k) = f_{n+1}(k)$.'"

Proof: Fix λ a sufficiently large regular cardinal and let N be a countable elementary substructure of H_λ containing P_κ and $\langle \alpha_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ and f and p. Build $\langle p'_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ and $\langle \sigma_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ such that $p'_0 = p$ and each of the following holds:

(1) $p'_{n+1} \restriction \alpha_n = p'_n \restriction \alpha_n$.

(2) $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_{\alpha_n}}$ "$\sigma_n \in \omega$ and $p'_{n+1} \restriction [\alpha_n, \kappa) \Vdash$ '$f(n) = \sigma_n$.'"

(3) $p'_n \restriction \alpha_n \Vdash$ "$p'_{n+1} \restriction [\alpha_n, \kappa) \leq p'_n \restriction [\alpha_n, \kappa)$."

(4) $p'_n \restriction \alpha_n$ is N-generic.

(5) $p'_n \restriction \alpha_n \Vdash$ "$p'_n \restriction [\alpha_n, \kappa) \in P_{\alpha_n,\kappa} \cap N[G_{P_{\alpha_n}}]$."

(6) $p'_n \in P_\kappa$.

Notice that (6) does not follow from the fact that $p'_n \restriction \alpha_n \in P_{\alpha_n}$ and $p'_n \restriction \alpha_n \Vdash$ "$p'_n \restriction [\alpha, \kappa) \in P_{\alpha,\kappa}$," but it does follow from (4) and (5).

Let $q_0 = \bigcup\{p'_n \restriction \alpha_n : n \in \omega\}$.

At this point we define $f_n(k) = \sigma_k$ for $k \leq n$. We have yet to define $f_n(k)$ for $k > n$. Notice that we cannot set $f_n(k) = \sigma_k$ for $k > n$ because in $V[G_{P_{\alpha_n}}]$ we have that σ_k is not an integer, but only a name.

Claim. For all $k \leq n$ we have $q_0 \restriction \alpha_n \Vdash$ "$q_0 \restriction [\alpha_n, \kappa) \Vdash$ '$f(k) = f_n(k)$.' "

Proof. Obvious.

Fix λ' a suffciently large regular cardinal and M a countable elementary substructure of $H_{\lambda'}$ containing N and q_0.

Build $\langle p_0^n : n \in \omega\rangle$ and $\langle \tau_n : n \in \omega\rangle$ such that $p_0^0 = q_0$ and each of the following holds:

(1) $p_0^{n+1} \restriction \alpha_n = p_0^n \restriction \alpha_n$.

(2) $p_0^{n+1} \leq p_0^n$.

(3) $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_{\alpha_n}}$ "$\tau_n \in \omega$ and $p_0^{n+1} \restriction [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}) \Vdash$ '$\tau_n = f_{n+1}(n+1)$.' "

(4) $p_0^n \restriction \alpha_n$ is M-generic.

(5) $p_0^n \restriction \alpha_n \Vdash$ "$p_0^{n+1} \restriction [\alpha_n, \kappa) \in P_{\alpha_n, \kappa} \cap M[G_{P_{\alpha_n}}]$."

Notice that (1), (4), and (5) imply that $p_0^{n+1} \in P_\kappa$; this is the reason the structure M is needed.

There is no difficulty in doing this. At this point, we define $f_n(n+1) = \tau_n$ for every n and we let $p_0 = \bigcup\{p_0^n \restriction \alpha_n : n \in \omega\}$.

At this point the following parts of the Lemma are exemplified:

(1) For all $k \leq n$ we have $p_0 \restriction \alpha_n \Vdash$ "$p_0 \restriction [\alpha_n, \kappa) \Vdash$ '$f(k) = f_n(k)$.' "

(2) $f_n \restriction (n+2)$ is a P_{α_n}-name for an element of ${}^{n+2}\omega$.

(3) $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_{\alpha_n}}$ "$p_0 \restriction [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}) \Vdash$ '$f_n(k) = f_{n+1}(k)$ for every $k \leq n+1$.' "

Choose λ^* a sufficiently large regular cardinal. We build $\langle p_n : n \in \omega\rangle$ and $\langle M_n : n \in \omega\rangle$ by recursion on $n \in \omega$. Let M_0 be a countable elementary substructure of H_{λ^*} containing M and p_0.

Fix n, and suppose p_n and M_n have been defined.

For each $i < n$ let q_n^i and ξ_{n+1}^i be chosen such that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_{\alpha_i}} \text{"}&\xi_{n+1}^i \in \omega \text{ and } q_n^i \in P_{\alpha_i, \alpha_{i+1}} \cap M_n[G_{P_{\alpha_i}}] \text{ and}\\ &q_n^i \leq p_n \restriction [\alpha_i, \alpha_{i+1}) \text{ and } q_n^i \Vdash \text{'}f_{i+1}(n+1) = \xi_{n+1}^i.\text{' "}\end{aligned}$$

Build $\langle r_n^i : i \leq n\rangle$ such that for each $i \leq n$ we have the following.

(1) $r_n^i \in P_{\alpha_i}$.

(2) $r_n^i \leq p_n \restriction \alpha_i$.

(3) r_n^i is M_n-generic.

(4) If $i < n$ then $r_n^{i+1} \restriction \alpha_i = r_n^i$.

(5) If $i < n$ then $r_n^i \Vdash$ "$r_n^{i+1} \restriction [\alpha_i, \alpha_{i+1}) \leq q_n^i$."

Then take p_{n+1} such that

$$p_{n+1} \restriction \alpha_n = \bigcup\{r_n^i : i \leq n\} \text{ and } p_{n+1} \restriction [\alpha_n, \kappa) = p_n \restriction [\alpha_n, \kappa).$$

Let M_{n+1} be a countable elementary substructure of H_{λ^*} containing M_n and p_{n+1}.

This completes the recursive construction.

We set $f_i(k) = \xi_k^i$ whenever $i + 1 < k$.

This completes the proof of the Lemma.

Definition 3.2. *For f and g in ${}^\omega\omega$ we say $f \leq g$ iff $(\forall n \in \omega)(f(n) \leq g(n))$. We say that P is ${}^\omega\omega$-bounding iff $V[G_P] \models$ "$(\forall f \in {}^\omega\omega)(\exists g \in {}^\omega\omega \cap V)(f \leq g)$."*

Theorem 3.3. *Suppose $\langle P_\eta : \eta \leq \kappa\rangle$ is a countable support iteration based on $\langle Q_\eta : \eta < \kappa\rangle$ and suppose $(\forall \eta < \kappa)(\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\eta}$ "Q_η is proper and ${}^\omega\omega$-bounding"). Suppose f is a P_κ-name for an element of ${}^\omega\omega$. Then whenever λ is a sufficiently large regular cardinal and N is a countable elementary substructure of H_λ and $\alpha < \kappa$ and $\{P_\kappa, \alpha, f\} \in N$ and $p \in P_\alpha$ and p is N-generic then $p \Vdash$ "$(\forall q \in P_{\alpha,\kappa} \cap N[G_{P_\alpha}])(\exists q^\# \leq q)(\exists h^\# \in {}^\omega\omega)(q^\# \Vdash$ '$f \leq h^\#$')."*

Proof: The proof proceeds by induction on κ. We assume that λ, N, α, p, and f are as in the hypothesis of the Theorem. Fix q a P_α-name in N such that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash$ "$q \in P_{\alpha,\kappa}$."

Case 1. $\kappa = \beta + 1$.

Because $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\beta}$ "Q_β is ${}^\omega\omega$-bounding," we may take q^* and h^* to be P_β-names such that

$$\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\beta} \text{"}q^* \leq q(\beta) \text{ and } h^* \in {}^\omega\omega \text{ and } q^* \Vdash \text{'}f \leq h^*\text{.'"}$$

We may assume that the names q^* and h^* are in N. By the induction hypothesis we may take P_α-names $\tilde{q}$ and h such that

$$p \Vdash \text{"}\tilde{q} \leq q \restriction \beta \text{ and } h \in {}^\omega\omega \text{ and } \tilde{q} \Vdash \text{'}h^* \leq h\text{.'"}$$

Define q' such that $p \Vdash$ "$q' = (\tilde{q}, q^*) \in P_{\alpha,\kappa}$." Clearly

$$p \Vdash \text{"}q' \leq q \text{ and } q' \Vdash \text{'}f \leq h\text{.'"}$$

This completes Case 1.

Case 2. $\mathrm{cf}(\kappa) > \omega$.

Because no ω-sequences of ordinals can be added at limit stages of uncountable cofinality, we may take β and f' and q' to be P_α-names in N such that

$$\mathbf{1} \Vdash \text{“}\alpha \leq \beta < \kappa \text{ and } \mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_{\alpha,\beta}} \text{‘}f' \in {}^\omega\omega\text{’ and } q' \leq q \text{ and}$$
$$q' \Vdash_{P_{\alpha,\kappa}} \text{‘}f' = f.\text{’”}$$

For every $\beta_0 \in \kappa \cap N$ such that $\alpha \leq \beta_0$ let $q^*(\beta_0)$ and $h(\beta_0)$ be P_α-names in N such that

$$\mathbf{1} \Vdash \text{“if } \beta = \beta_0 \text{ and there is some } q^* \leq q' \restriction \beta \text{ and some } h \in {}^\omega\omega \text{ such that}$$
$$q^* \Vdash \text{‘}f' \leq h,\text{’ then } q^*(\beta_0) \text{ and } h(\beta_0) \text{ are witnesses thereto.”}$$

Let q^* and h and s be P_α-names such that for every $\beta_0 \in \kappa \cap N$, if $\alpha \leq \beta_0$ then

$$\mathbf{1} \Vdash \text{“if } \beta = \beta_0 \text{ then } q^* = q^*(\beta_0) \text{ and } h = h(\beta_0) \text{ and } s \in P_{\alpha,\kappa}$$
$$\text{and } s \restriction \beta = q^* \text{ and } s \restriction [\beta, \kappa) = q' \restriction [\beta, \kappa).\text{”}$$

Claim 1: $p \Vdash$ “$s \leq q$ and $h \in {}^\omega\omega$ and $s \Vdash$ ‘$f \leq h$.’”

Proof: Suppose $p' \leq p$. Fix $p^\# \leq p'$ and $\beta_0 < \kappa$ such that $p^\# \Vdash$ “$\beta_0 = \beta$.” Because the name β is in N and $p^\#$ is N-generic, we have that $\beta_0 \in N$. Notice by the induction hypothesis that we have

$$p \Vdash \text{“there is some } q^\# \leq q' \restriction \beta_0 \text{ and some } h^\# \in {}^\omega\omega$$
$$\text{such that } q^\# \Vdash \text{‘}f' \leq h^\#.\text{’”}$$

Hence

$$p^\# \Vdash \text{“}q^* = q^*(\beta_0) \leq q' \restriction \beta \text{ and } h = h(\beta_0) \in {}^\omega\omega \text{ and}$$
$$q^* \Vdash \text{‘}f' \leq h \text{ and } q' \restriction [\beta, \kappa) \Vdash \text{“}f' = f.\text{” ’”}$$

Therefore $p^\# \Vdash$ “$s \Vdash$ ‘$f \leq h$.’”

We conclude that $p \Vdash$ “$s \Vdash$ ‘$f \leq h$.’” Claim 1 is established.

This completes Case 2.

Case 3. $\mathrm{cf}(\kappa) = \omega$.

Let $\langle \alpha_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ be an increasing sequence from $\kappa \cap N$ cofinal in κ such that $\alpha_0 = \alpha$.

Let $\langle g_j : j < \omega \rangle$ list every P_α-name $g \in N$ such that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\alpha}$ “$g \in {}^\omega\omega$.”

Fix $\langle (p_n, f_n) : n \in \omega \rangle$ as in Lemma 3.1 (applied in $V[G_{P_\alpha}]$). That is, $\mathbf{1} \Vdash$ “$p_0 \leq q$” and for every $n \in \omega$ we have that each of the following holds in $V[G_{P_\alpha}]$:

(0) $p_n \in P_{\alpha,\kappa}$.

(1) For every $k \le n$ we have $p_0\restriction\alpha_n \Vdash$ “$p_0\restriction[\alpha_n, \kappa) \Vdash$ ‘$f(k) = f_n(k)$.’ ”

(2) f_n is a P_{α_n}-name for an element of ${}^\omega\omega$.

(3) $p_0\restriction\alpha_n \Vdash$ “$p_0\restriction[\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}) \Vdash$ ‘$f_n(k) = f_{n+1}(k)$ for every $k \le n+1$.’ ”

(4) $p_{n+1} \le p_n$.

(5) Whenever $k \le m < \omega$ we have $p_0\restriction\alpha_n \Vdash$ “$p_m\restriction[\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}) \Vdash$ ‘$f_n(k) = f_{n+1}(k)$.’ ”

We may assume that for every $n \in \omega$ the P_α-names p_n and f_n are in N, and, furthermore, the sequence $\langle\langle p_n, f_n\rangle : n \in \omega\rangle$ is in N.

In $V[G_{P_\alpha}]$, define $\langle g^n : n \in \omega\rangle$ by

$$g^n(k) = \max\{f_0(k), \max\{g_j(k) : j \le n\}\}.$$

Also in $V[G_{P_\alpha}]$ define $g \in {}^\omega\omega$ such that

$$g(k) = g^k(k) \text{ for all } k \in \omega.$$

Claim 2. Suppose $\alpha \le \beta \le \gamma < \kappa$ and suppose f' is a P_γ-name for an element of ${}^\omega\omega$. Then

$$\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\beta} \text{“}V[G_{P_\alpha}] \models \text{‘}(\forall q \in P_{\beta,\gamma})(\exists q' \le q)(\exists h' \in {}^\omega\omega)(q' \Vdash \text{“}f' \le h'\text{”}).\text{’ ”}$$

Proof: Given $r_1 \in P_\alpha$ and a P_α-name r_2 for an element of $P_{\alpha,\beta}$ and a P_β-name q for an element of $P_{\beta,\gamma} \cap V[G_{P_\alpha}]$, choose λ' a sufficiently large regular cardinal and N' a countable elementary substructure of $H_{\lambda'}$ containing $\{r_1, r_2, q, P_\kappa, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, f'\}$. Choose $r_1' \le r_1$ such that r_1' is N'-generic. By the overall induction hypothesis (i.e., because $\gamma < \kappa$) we have

$$r_1' \Vdash \text{“}(\exists s \le (r_2, q))(\exists h' \in {}^\omega\omega)(s \Vdash \text{‘}f' \le h'\text{’}).\text{”}$$

Consequently we may fix s and h' such that

$$(r_1', s\restriction\beta) \Vdash \text{“}V[G_{P_\alpha}] \models \text{‘}s\restriction[\beta,\gamma) \le q \text{ and } s\restriction[\beta,\gamma) \Vdash \text{“}f' \le h'.\text{” ’ ”}$$

The Claim is established.

Claim 3. We may be build $\langle r_n : n \in \omega\rangle$ such that $r_0 = p$ and for every $n \in \omega$ we have that the following hold:

(1) $r_n \in P_{\alpha_n}$ is N-generic.

(2) $r_{n+1}\restriction\alpha_n = r_n$.

(3) $r_n \Vdash$ “$f_n \le g$.”

(4) $p \Vdash$ “$r_n\restriction[\alpha, \alpha_n) \le p_0\restriction[\alpha, \alpha_n)$.”

Proof: Work by induction on n. For $n = 0$ there is nothing to prove, so assume that $n > 0$ and suppose we have r_n.

Fix P_{α_n}-names F_0 and F_2 such that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash$ "if there are functions F_0' and F_2' such that $F_0' \in V[G_{P_\alpha}]$ maps $P_{\alpha_n,\alpha_{n+1}}$ into ${}^\omega\omega$ and $F_2' \in V[G_{P_\alpha}]$ maps $P_{\alpha_n,\alpha_{n+1}}$ into $P_{\alpha_n,\alpha_{n+1}}$ and for every $q' \in P_{\alpha_n,\alpha_{n+1}} \cap V[G_{P_\alpha}]$ we have $F_2'(q') \leq q'$ and $F_2'(q') \Vdash$ '$f_{n+1} \leq F_0'(q')$', then F_0 and F_2 are witnesses to this."

We may assume that the names F_0 and F_2 are in N.

By Claim 2 we have

(*) $r_n \Vdash$ "$F_0 \in V[G_{P_\alpha}]$ maps $P_{\alpha_n,\alpha_{n+1}}$ into ${}^\omega\omega$ and $F_2 \in V[G_{P_\alpha}]$ maps $P_{\alpha_n,\alpha_{n+1}}$ into $P_{\alpha_n,\alpha_{n+1}}$ and for every $q' \in P_{\alpha_n,\alpha_{n+1}} \cap V[G_{P_\alpha}]$ we have $F_2(q') \leq q'$ and $F_2(q') \Vdash$ '$f_{n+1} \leq F_0(q')$.' "

In $V[G_{P_{\alpha_n}}]$, define g_n^* by $(\forall i \in \omega)(g_n^*(i) = \max\{F_0(p_m{\restriction}[\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}))(i) : m \leq i\})$.

We may assume the name g_n^* is in N.

Notice that we have

$$r_n \Vdash \text{"}g_n^* \in N[G_{P_{\alpha_n}}] \cap V[G_{P_\alpha}] = N[G_{P_\alpha}].\text{"}$$

Therefore we may choose a P_{α_n}-name k such that $r_n \Vdash$ "$g_n^* = g_k$" (in our notation, we suppress the fact that k depends on n).

Subclaim 1: $r_n \Vdash$ "$F_2(p_k{\restriction}[\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1})) \Vdash$ '$f_{n+1} \leq g$.' "

Proof: For $i \geq k$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} r_n \Vdash \text{"}F_2(p_k{\restriction}[\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1})) \Vdash \text{'}f_{n+1}(i) &\leq F_0(p_k{\restriction}[\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}))(i) \\ &\leq g_n^*(i) = g_k(i) \leq g^i(i) = g(i).\text{' "} \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality is by (*), the second inequality is by the definition of g_n^* along with the fact that $i \geq k$, the equality is by the definition of k, the next inequality is by the definition of g^i along with the fact that $i \geq k$, and the last equality is by the definition of g.

For $i < k$, we have

$$r_n \Vdash \text{"}p_k{\restriction}[\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}) \Vdash \text{'}f_{n+1}(i) = f_n(i) \leq g(i).\text{' "}$$

The equality is by the choice of $\langle (f_m, p_m) : m \in \omega\rangle$ (see Lemma 3.1), and the inequality is by the induction hypothesis that Claim 3 holds for integers less than or equal to n.

Because $r_n \Vdash$ "$F_2(p_k{\restriction}[\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1})) \leq p_k{\restriction}[\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1})$," we have that the Subclaim is established.

Using the Proper Iteration Lemma, choose $r_{n+1} \in P_{\alpha_{n+1}}$ such that r_{n+1} is N-generic and $r_{n+1} \restriction \alpha_n = r_n$ and

$$r_n \Vdash \text{“}r_{n+1} \restriction [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}) \leq F_2(p_k \restriction [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1})).\text{”}$$

This completes the proof of Claim 3.

Let $r' = \bigcup\{r_n : n \in \omega\}$. We have that

$$p \Vdash \text{“}r' \restriction [\alpha, \kappa) \leq q \text{ and } r' \restriction [\alpha, \kappa) \Vdash \text{‘}f \leq g.\text{’”}$$

The Theorem is established.

Corollary 3.4. *Suppose* $\langle P_\eta : \eta \leq \kappa \rangle$ *is a countable support iteration based on* $\langle Q_\eta : \eta < \kappa \rangle$ *and suppose* $(\forall \eta < \kappa)(\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\eta}$ “Q_η is proper and ${}^\omega\omega$-bounding”). *Then* P_κ *is* ω^ω*-bounding.*

Proof. Take $\alpha = 0$ in Theorem 3.3.

4 The Sacks property

In this section we present Shelah's proof of the preservation of “proper plus Sacks property” under countable support iteration. The proof is a special case of [12, Theorem VI.1.12].

Definition 4.1. *For* x *and* y *in* ${}^\omega(\omega - \{0\})$*, we say that* $x \ll y$ *iff* $(\forall n \in \omega)$ $(x(n) \leq y(n))$ *and*

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} y(n)/x(n) = \infty$$

In particular for $x \in {}^\omega(\omega - \{0\})$ *we have* $1 \ll x$ *iff* $(\forall k \in \omega)(\exists n \in \omega)(\forall m \geq n)$ $(x(m) > k)$.

Definition 4.2. *For* $T \subseteq {}^{<\omega}\omega$ *a tree and* $x \in {}^\omega(\omega - \{0\})$*, we say that* T *is an* x*-sized tree iff for every* $n \in \omega$ *we have that the cardinality of* $T \cap {}^n\omega$ *is at most* $x(n)$.

Definition 4.3. *For* $T \subseteq {}^{<\omega}\omega$ *we set* $[T]$ *equal to the set of all* $f \in {}^\omega\omega$ *such that every initial segment of* f *is in* T*. That is,* $[T]$ *is the set of infinite branches of* T.

Definition 4.4. *A poset* P *has the Sacks property iff whenever* $x \in {}^\omega(\omega - \{0\})$ *and* $1 \ll x$ *then we have*

$$\mathbf{1} \Vdash_P \text{“}(\forall f \in {}^\omega\omega)(\exists H \in V)(H \text{ is an } x\text{-sized tree and } f \in [H]).\text{”}$$

Definition 4.5. *Suppose* $n \in \omega$. *We say that* t *is an* n*-tree iff* $t \subseteq {}^{\leq n}\omega$ *and* t *is closed under initial segments and* t *is non-empty and for every* $\eta \in t$ *there is* $\nu \in t$ *such that* ν *extends* η *and* $\mathrm{lh}(\nu) = n$.

Lemma 4.6. *Suppose* P *has the Sacks property and* x *and* z *are elements of* ${}^{\omega}(\omega - \{0\})$ *and* $x \ll z$. *Then we have*

$$\mathbf{1} \Vdash_P \text{“}(\forall T)(\text{if } T \text{ is an } x\text{-sized tree then}$$
$$(\exists H \in V)(H \text{ is a } z\text{-sized tree and } T \subseteq H)).\text{”}$$

Proof: Work in $V[G_P]$. For every $n \in \omega$ let

$$\mathcal{T}_n(x) = \{t \subseteq {}^{\leq n}\omega : t \text{ is an } n\text{-tree}$$
$$\text{and } (\forall i \leq n)(|t \cap {}^{i}\omega| \leq x(i))\}.$$

Let

$$\mathcal{T}(x) = \bigcup\{\mathcal{T}_n(x) : n \in \omega\}.$$

Under the natural order, $\mathcal{T}(x)$ is isomorphic to ${}^{<\omega}\omega$.

Define $\zeta \in [\mathcal{T}(x)]$ by setting $\zeta(n) = T \cap {}^{\leq n}\omega$ for all $n \in \omega$.

Define $y \in {}^{\omega}(\omega - \{0\})$ by setting $y(n)$ equal to the greatest integer less than or equal to $z(n)/x(n)$ for every $n \in \omega$. Clearly $1 \ll y$, so we may choose a y-sized tree $H' \subseteq \mathcal{T}(x)$ such that $\zeta \in [H']$ and $H' \in V$.

Let $H^* = \bigcup H'$ and let

$$H = \{\eta \in H^* : (\forall n \in \omega)(\exists \nu \in {}^{n}\omega \cap H^*)(\nu \text{ is comparable with } \eta)\}.$$

We have that H is a z-sized tree and $H \in V$ and $T \subseteq H$.

The Lemma is established.

Lemma 4.7. *Suppose* n^* *is an integer and suppose* y *and* z *are elements of* ${}^{\omega}\omega$ *and* $y \ll z$. *Suppose* P *is a forcing such that* $V[G_P] \models$ “for every countable $X \subseteq V$ there is a countable $Y \in V$ such that $X \subseteq Y$.” *Suppose in* $V[G_P]$ *we have a sequence* $\langle T_n : n \in \omega\rangle$ *such that for every* n *we have* $T_n \in V$ *is a* y*-sized tree. Then in* $V[G_P]$ *there is a* z*-sized tree* $T^* \in V$ *and an increasing sequence of integers* $\langle k(n) : n \in \omega\rangle$ *such that* $k(0) = 0$ *and* $k(1) \geq n^*$ *and* $(\forall n > 0)(k(n) > n)$ *and for every* $\eta \in {}^{<\omega}\omega$ *we have*

$$(\forall n \in \omega)(\exists i < n)(\eta \restriction k(n+1) \in T_{k(i)}) \text{ implies } \eta \in T^*.$$

Proof: Fix $x \in {}^{\omega}(\omega - \{0\})$ such that $y \ll x \ll z$. Fix $\langle x_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ a sequence of elements of ${}^{\omega}(\omega - \{0\})$ such that $(\forall n \in \omega)(y \ll x_n \ll x_{n+1} \ll x$.

Work in $V[G_P]$. Let $b \in V$ be a countable set of y-sized trees such that $\{T_n : n \in \omega\} \subseteq b$. Let $\langle S_n : n \in \omega \rangle \in V$ enumerate b with infinitely many repetitions with $S_0 = T_0$.

Define $h \in {}^{\omega}\omega$ by setting $h(0) = 0$ and for every $n > 0$ setting $h(n)$ equal to the least $m > h(n-1)$ such that $T_n = S_m$.

For each $n \in \omega$ set $k(n)$ equal to the least $k \geq n^*$ such that

$$(\forall j \geq k)(2x_n(j) \leq x_{n+1}(j) \text{ and } (n+2)y(j) \leq z(j)).$$

Build $\langle S'_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ by setting $S'_0 = S_0$ and for every $n \in \omega$ let

$$S'_{n+1} = \{\rho \in S_n : \rho \restriction k(n) \in S'_n\} \cup S'_n.$$

Claim 1. For all $n \in \omega$ we have that S'_n is an x_n-sized tree.

Proof: By induction on n. Clearly S'_0 is an x_0-sized tree. For every $t < k(n)$ we have that $|S'_{n+1} \cap {}^{t}\omega| \leq |S'_n \cap {}^{t}\omega| \leq x_n(t) \leq x_{n+1}(t)$. For every $t \geq k(n)$ we have $|S'_{n+1} \cap {}^{t}\omega| \leq |S'_n \cap {}^{t}\omega| + |S_n \cap {}^{t}\omega| \leq x_n(t) + y(t) \leq x_{n+1}(t)$. The Claim is established.

Let $T^* = \{\eta \in {}^{<\omega}\omega : (\forall n > 0)(\exists i < n)(\eta \restriction k(n) \in S'_{k(i)})\}$.

Claim 2. T^* is a z-saized tree.

Proof. Given $t \geq k(1)$, choose $n \in \omega$ such that $k(n) \leq t < k(n+1)$. We have

$$T^* \cap {}^{t}\omega = \{\eta \in {}^{t}\omega : (\forall j \leq n+1)(\exists i \leq j)(\eta \restriction k(j) \in T_{k(i)})\}$$

and so

$$|T^* \cap {}^{t}\omega| \leq \Sigma_{i \leq n+1} |T_{k(i)} \cap {}^{t}\omega| \leq (n+2)y(t) \leq z(t).$$

For $t < k(1)$ we have $T^* \cap {}^{t}\omega = T_0 \cap {}^{t}\omega$, so $|T^* \cap {}^{t}\omega| \leq y(t) \leq z(t)$.

The Claim is established

Build $\langle n'_i : i \in \omega \rangle$ an increasing sequence of integers such that $n'_0 = 0$ and $n'_1 > k(1)$ and for every $i \in \omega$ we have

(A) $h(n'_i) < n'_{i+1}$ and

(B) $k(n'_i) < n'_{i+1}$ and

(C) $(\exists t)(n'_i < k(t) < n'_{i+1})$.

For every $i \in \omega$ let $m_i = h(n'_{4i+4})$.

Fix $\eta \in {}^{<\omega}\omega$ such that

(D) $(\forall i > 0)(\exists j < 0)(\eta \restriction m_{i+1} \in T_{m_j})$.

To establish the Lemma, it suffices to show

(E) $(\forall i > 0)(\exists j < i)(\eta\restriction k(i) \in S'_{k(j)})$,

since this implies $\eta \in T^*$.

Claim 3. $(\forall i > 0)(\exists j < i)(\eta\restriction n'_{i+1} \in S'_{n'_j})$.

We prove this by induction on i.

Case 1. $i < 9$.

We have $n'_{i+1} \leq n'_8 \leq h(n'_8) = m_1$ and we have $\eta\restriction m_1 \in T_0$. Therefore $\eta\restriction n'_{n+1} \in T_0 = S_0 = S'_0$.

Case 2. $i \geq 9$,

Fix i^* such that $4i^* + 2 \leq i < 4i^* + 6$.

By (D) we may fix $j^* < i^*$ such that $\eta\restriction m_{i^*+1} \in T^*_{m_{j^*}}$.

Because $n'_{i+1} \leq h(n'_{4i^*+8}) \leq m_{i^*+1}$, we have $\eta\restriction n'_{i+1} \in T_{m_{j^*}}$.

If $m_{j^*} = 0$, we are done, so assume otherwise.

Subclaim 1. Suppose $\rho \in T_{m_{j^*}}$ and $\rho\restriction k(n'_{4j^*+4}) \in S'_{n'_{4j^*+4}}$. Then $\rho \in S'_{n'_{4j^*+5}}$.

Proof: We have $T_{m_{j^*}} = T_{h(n'_{4j^*+4})} = S_{n'_{4j^*+4}}$. Therefore $\rho \in S'_{n'_{4j^*+4}+1} \subseteq S'_{n'_{4j^*+5}}$.

The Subclaim is established.

Subclaim 2. $k(n'_{4j^*+4}) \leq m_{i^*+1}$.

Proof: $m_{i^*+1} = h(n'_{4i^*+8}) > n'_{4i^*+7} \geq n'_{4j^*+11} \geq n'_{4j^*+6} > k(n'_{4j^*+4})$. The Subclaim is established.

Let $\rho = \eta\restriction m_{i^*+1}$.

By the choice of j^* we have

(F) $\rho \in T_{m_{j^*}}$.

By Subclaim 2 we have

(G) $\rho\restriction k(n'_{4j^*+4}) = \eta\restriction k(n'_{4j^*+4})$.

Subclaim 3. $\eta\restriction n'_{4j^*+5} \in S'_{n'_{4j^*+4}}$.

Proof: Because $4j^* + 4 \leq i$ we may use the induction hypothesis of the proof of Claim 3. The Subclaim is established.

By (B), (G), and Subclaim 3, we have $\rho\restriction k(n'_{4j^*+4}) \in S'_{n'_{4j^*+4}}$.

Therefore by Subclaim 1, we have $\rho \in S'_{n'_{4j^*+5}}$.

To complete the proof of the Lemma, suppose $i > 0$. We must show that there is $t < i$ such that $\eta\restriction k(i) \in S'_{k(t)}$.

Case 1: $k(i-1) < n'_0$.

By (C) we have $n'_1 \geq k(i)$. By Claim 3 we have $\eta\restriction n'_2 \in S_0$. Hence $\eta\restriction n'_1 \in S_0$. Hence $\eta\restriction k(i) \in S_0$.

Case 2: $n'_0 \leq k(i-1)$.

By (A) we know that there is at most one element of $\{n'_j : j \in \omega\}$ strictly between $k(i-1)$ and $k(i)$. Hence we may fix $j > 0$ such that $n'_{j-1} \leq k(i-1) < k(i) \leq n'_{j+1}$. If $\eta \restriction n'_{j+1} \in S_0$ then $\eta \restriction k(i) \in S_0$ and we are done, so assume otherwise. By Claim 3 we may fix $m < j$ such that $\eta \restriction n'_{j+1} \in S'_{n'_m}$. We have $\eta \restriction k(i) \in S'_{n'_m} \subseteq S'_{n'_{j-1}} \subseteq S'_{k_{i-1}}$ and again we are done.

The Lemma is established.

Lemma 4.8. *Suppose* $x \in {}^{\omega}(\omega - \{0\})$ *and* $z \in {}^{\omega}(\omega - \{0\})$ *and* $x \ll z$*. Suppose that for every* $n \in \omega$ *we have that* T_n *is an* x*-sized tree. Suppose* T *is an* x*-sized tree. Then there is a* z*-sized tree* $T^* \supseteq T$ *and a sequence of integers* $\langle m_i : i \in \omega \rangle$ *such that for every* $\eta \in T$ *and* $i \in \omega$ *and every* $\nu \in T_{m_i}$ *extending* η*, if* $\text{length}(\eta) \geq m_i$ *then* $\nu \in T^*$*.*

Proof. Choose $y \in {}^{\omega}(\omega - \{0\})$ such that $x \ll y \ll z$. Fix $n^* \in \omega$ such that $(\forall n \geq n^*)(2x(n) \leq y(n))$. For every $n \geq n^*$ define $T'_n = \{\eta \in {}^{<\omega}\omega : \eta \in T$ or $\eta \in T_n$ and $\eta \restriction n \in T\}$. For every $n < n^*$ let $T'_n = T$.

For every $n \in \omega$ we have that T'_n is a y-sized tree.

By Lemma 4.7 we may choose T^* a z-sized tree and $\langle k_i : i \in \omega \rangle$ an increasing sequence of integers such that $k_0 = 0$ and $k_1 \geq n^*$ and

$$(\forall \eta \in {}^{<\omega}\omega)((\forall n \in \omega)(\exists i \leq n)(\eta \restriction k_n \in T'_{k_i}) \text{ implies } \eta \in T^*).$$

Clearly $T \subseteq T^*$.

For every $i \in \omega$ set $m_i = k_{i+1}$.

Now suppose that $\eta \in T$ and $i \in \omega$ and $\text{length}(\eta) \geq m_i$ and ν extends η and $\nu \in T_{m_i}$. We show $\nu \in T^*$.

Because ν extends an element of T of length at least m_i, we have that $\nu \in T'_{m_i}$. Choose $h \in [T'_{m_i}]$ extending ν. It suffices to show that $h \in [T^*]$. Therefore it suffices to show that for every $n \in \omega$ we have

$(*)_n$ $(\exists j \leq n)(h \restriction k_n \in T'_{k_j})$.

Fix $n \in \omega$.

Case 1: $i < n$.

Because $h \in [T'_{k_{i+1}}]$ we have that $h \in [T'_{k_n}]$. Therefore $h \restriction k_n \in T'_{k_n}$ and we have that $(*)_n$ holds.

Case 2: $n \leq i$.

We have $h{\restriction}k_n = \eta{\restriction}k_n \in T = T'_0$. Therefore $(*)_n$ holds.

The Lemma is established.

Lemma 4.9. *Suppose* $y \in {}^{\omega}(\omega - \{0\})$ *and* $z \in {}^{\omega}(\omega - \{0\})$, *and suppose* $\langle x_n : n \in \omega\rangle$ *is a sequence of elements of* ${}^{\omega}(\omega - \{0\})$ *such that* $(\forall n \in \omega)(x_n \ll x_{n+1} \ll y \ll z)$. *Suppose* T *is an* x_0*-sized tree. Suppose for every* $n \in \omega$, *we have* $x^*_n \in {}^{\omega}(\omega - \{0\})$ *and* $x^*_n \ll x_n \ll x^*_{n+1}$, *and we have* $\langle x_{n,j} : n \in \omega,\ j \in \omega\rangle$ *is a sequence of elements of* ${}^{\omega}(\omega - \{0\})$ *such that for every* $j \in \omega$ *we have* $x_n \ll x_{n,j} \ll x_{n,j+1} \ll x^*_{n+1}$. *Suppose* $\langle T_{n,j} : n \in \omega,\ j \in \omega\rangle$ *is a sequence such that for every* $n \in \omega$ *and* $j \in \omega$ *we have that* $T_{n,j}$ *is an* $x_{n,j}$*-sized tree. Then there are* $\langle T^n : n \in \omega\rangle$ *and* T^* *such that* T^* *is a* z*-sized tree and* $T \subseteq T^*$ *and for every* $n \in \omega$ *we have*

(i) $T^n \subseteq T^{n+1}$ and T^n is an x_n-sized tree, and

(ii) for every forcing notion P we have that in $V[G_P]$ for every $j \in \omega$ and every $g \in [T_{n,j}] \cap V[G_P]$ there is $k \in \omega$ such that for every $\eta \in T_{n,j}$ extending $g{\restriction}k$, if $\eta{\restriction}k \in T^n \cap T^*$ then $\eta \in T^{n+1} \cap T^*$.

Proof: Let $T^0 = T$. Given T^n, build $\langle T'_{n,j} : j \in \omega\rangle$ as follows. Let $T'_{n,0} = T^n$. Given $T'_{n,j}$ take $m(n,j) \in \omega$ such that

$$(\forall t \geq m(n,j))(2x_{n,j}(t) \leq x_{n,j+1}(t)).$$

Let $T'_{n,j+1} = \{\eta \in T_{n,j} \colon \eta{\restriction}m(n,j) \in T'_{n,j}\} \cup T'_{n,j}$.

Claim 1. Whenever $i \leq j < \omega$ we have $T'_{n,i} \subseteq T'_{n,j}$.

Proof. Clear.

Claim 2. Suppose T^n is an x_n-sized tree. Then $(\forall j \in \omega)(T'_{n,j}$ is an $x_{n,j}$-sized tree).

Proof: It is clear that $T'_{n,0}$ is an $x_{n,0}$-sized tree. Assume that $T'_{n,j}$ is an $x_{n,j}$-sized tree. Fix $t \in \omega$.

Case 1: $t < m(n,j)$.

We have that

$$T'_{n,j+1} \cap {}^{t}\omega = T'_{n,j} \cap {}^{t}\omega$$

and so

$$|T'_{n,j+1} \cap {}^{t}\omega| \leq x_{n,j}(t) \leq x_{n,j+1}(t).$$

Case 2: $t \geq m(n,j)$.

We have

$$T'_{n,j+1} \cap {}^t\omega \subseteq (T'_{n,j} \cap {}^t\omega) \cup (T_{n,j} \cap {}^t\omega).$$

Therefore we have

$$|T'_{n,j+1} \cap {}^t\omega| \leq 2x_{n,j}(t) \leq x_{n,j+1}(t).$$

The Claim is established.

For each $n \in \omega$, using Claim 2 and Lemma 4.7 we my find an increasing sequence of integers $\langle k_{n,j} : j \in \omega \rangle$ and T^{n+1} such that $k_{n,0} = 0$ and $(\forall j > 0)(k_{n,j} > j)$ and if T^n is an x_n-sized tree, then T^{n+1} is an x_{n+1}-sized tree such that for all $\eta \in {}^{<\omega}\omega$, we have

$$(\forall j \in \omega)(\exists i \leq j)(\eta \restriction k_{n,j} \in T'_{n,k_{n,i}}) \text{ implies } \eta \in T^{n+1}.$$

This completes the construcion of $\langle T^n : n \in \omega \rangle$ and $\langle T_{n,j} : j \in \omega,\, n \in \omega \rangle$.

Applying mathematical induction, we have that each T^n is in fact an x_n-sized tree.

Claim 3. $T^n \subseteq T^{n+1}$ for every $n \in \omega$.

Proof: By Claim 1 we have that $T^n \subseteq T'_{n,i}$ for every $i \in \omega$. By the definition of T^{n+1} we have that

$$T^{n+1} \supseteq \bigcap \{T'_{n,k_{n,i}} : i \in \omega\} \supseteq \bigcap \{T'_{n,i} : i \in \omega\} \supseteq T^n.$$

The Claim is established.

Applying Lemma 4.7 again we obtain an increasing sequence of integers $\langle k_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ and a z-sized tree T^* such that $(\forall n \in \omega)(n < k_n)$ and for every $\eta \in {}^{<\omega}\omega$, we have that

$$(\forall n \in \omega)(\exists i \leq n)(\eta \restriction k_n \in T^{k_i}) \text{ implies } \eta \in T^*.$$

Notice that $T^0 \subseteq \bigcap \{T^n : n \in \omega\} \subseteq T^*$.

Now we verify that $\langle T^n : n \in \omega \rangle$ and T^* satisfy the remaining conclusions of the Lemma. Accordingly, fix a forcing notion P and work in $V[G_P]$. Fix $n \in \omega$ and $j \in \omega$ and $g \in [T_{n,j}]$. Let

$$k = \max(k_n, \max\{k_{n,j'} : j' \leq j\}, \max\{m(n,j') : j' \leq j\}).$$

Fix $\eta \in T_{n,j}$ extending $g \restriction k$ and assume that $\eta \restriction k \in T^n \cap T^*$.

Claim 4. $\eta \in T^{n+1}$.

Proof: It suffices to show

$$(\forall j' \in \omega)(\exists i \leq j')(\eta \restriction k_{n,j'} \in T'_{n,k_{n,i}}).$$

Fix $j' \in \omega$ and let $i = \min(j, j')$.

Case 1: $j' \leq j$.

Because $k_{n,j'} \leq k$ we have that $\eta \restriction k_{n,j'} \in T^n \subseteq T'_{n,k_{n,i}}$, as required.

Case 2: $j < j'$.

It suffices to show that $\eta \restriction k_{n,j'} \in T'_{n,k_{n,j}}$. Because $g \restriction k = \eta \restriction k \in T^n$ and $m(n,j) \leq k$, we have that $g \restriction m(n,j) \in T^n \subseteq T'_{n,j}$. Because we have $\eta \in T_{n,j}$ and $\eta \restriction m(n,j) = g \restriction m(n,j) \in T'_{n,j}$, we know by the definition of $T'_{n,j+1}$ and Claim 1 that $\eta \in T'_{n,j+1} \subseteq T'_{n,k_{n,j}}$.

Claim 4 is established.

Claim 5. $\eta \in T^*$.

Proof: It suffices to show $(\forall i \in \omega)(\exists i' \leq i)(\eta \restriction k_i \in T^{k_{i'}})$. Towards this end, fix $i \in \omega$.

Case 1: $i \leq n$.

Because $\eta \restriction k \in T^*$ and η extends $g \restriction k$, we have $g \restriction k_i \in T^*$ and hence we may take $i' \leq i$ such that $g \restriction k_i \in T^{k_{i'}}$. But we also have $\eta \restriction k_i = g \restriction k_i$, so we finish Case 1.

Case 2: $n < i$.

We let $i' = i$. By Claim 4 we have $\eta \restriction k_i \in T^{n+1}$, and by Claim 3 we have that $T^{n+1} \subseteq T^{k_n} \subseteq T^{k_i}$.

Claim 5 and the Lemma are established.

Theorem 4.10. *Suppose $\langle P_\eta : \eta \leq \kappa \rangle$ is a countable support iteration based on $\langle Q_\eta : \eta < \kappa \rangle$ and suppose $(\forall \eta < \kappa)(\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\eta}$ "Q_η is proper and has the Sacks property"). Suppose λ is a sufficiently large regular cardinal and $\alpha < \kappa$ and x and z are P_α-names and T is a P_κ-name and $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\alpha}$ "$x \in {}^\omega(\omega - \{0\})$ and $z \in {}^\omega(\omega - \{0\})$ and $x \ll z$" and $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\kappa}$ "T is an x-sized tree." Suppose N is a countable elementary submodel of H_λ and $\{P_\kappa, \alpha, x, z, T\} \in N$. Suppose $p \in P_\alpha$ and p is N-generic. Then $p \Vdash$ "$(\forall q \in P_{\alpha,\kappa} \cap N[P_{G_{P_\alpha}}])(\exists q' \leq q)(\exists H)(H$ is a z-sized tree and $q' \Vdash$ '$T \subseteq H$')."*

Proof: The proof proceeds by induction on κ. We assume that λ, N, α, p, x, z, and T are as in the hypothesis of the Theorem. Fix a P_α-name q in N such that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash$ "$q \in P_{\alpha,\kappa}$."

Case 1. $\kappa = \beta + 1$.

Fix y a P_α-name in N such that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash$ "$x \ll y \ll z$."

Using Lemma 4.6, we may choose $\tilde{q}$ and H' such that

$$\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\beta} \text{“}\tilde{q} \le q(\beta) \text{ and } H' \text{ is a } y\text{-sized tree and } \tilde{q} \Vdash \text{‘}T \subseteq H'.\text{’”}$$

We may assume that the names $\tilde{q}$ and H' are elements of N. Using the induction hypothesis we get P_α-names q^* and H such that

$$p \Vdash \text{“}q^* \le q \restriction \beta \text{ and } H \text{ is an } x\text{-sized tree and } q^* \Vdash \text{‘}H' \subseteq H.\text{’”}$$

We have that $p \Vdash$ “$(q^*, \tilde{q}) \le q'$” and Case 1 is established.

Case 2. $\mathrm{cf}(\kappa) > \omega$.

Because no ω-sequences of ordinals can be added at limit stages of uncountable cofinality, we may take β and T' and q' to be P_α-names in N such that

$$\begin{gathered}\mathbf{1} \Vdash \text{“}\alpha \le \beta < \kappa \text{ and } T' \text{ is a } P_{\alpha,\beta}\text{-name and } q' \le q \text{ and} \\ \mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_{\alpha,\beta}} \text{‘}T' \text{ is an } x\text{-sized tree’ and } q' \Vdash_{P_{\alpha,\kappa}} \text{‘}T' = T.\text{’”}\end{gathered}$$

For every $\beta_0 \in \kappa \cap N$ such that $\alpha \le \beta_0$ let $\tilde{q}(\beta_0)$ and $H(\beta_0)$ be P_α-names in N such that

$$\begin{gathered}\mathbf{1} \Vdash \text{“if } \beta = \beta_0 \text{ and there is some } \tilde{q} \le q' \restriction \beta \text{ and some } H^* \\ \text{such that } H^* \text{ is a } z\text{-sized tree and } \tilde{q} \Vdash \text{‘}T' \subseteq H^*,\text{’} \\ \text{then } q^*(\beta_0) \text{ and } H(\beta_0) \text{ are witnesses thereto.”}\end{gathered}$$

Let q^* and H and s be P_α-names such that for every $\beta_0 \in \kappa \cap N$, if $\alpha \le \beta_0$, then

$$\begin{gathered}\mathbf{1} \Vdash \text{“if } \beta = \beta_0 \text{ then } q^* = q^*(\beta_0) \text{ and } H = H(\beta_0) \text{ and } s \in P_{\alpha,\kappa} \text{ and} \\ s \restriction \beta = q^* \text{ and } s \restriction [\beta, \kappa) = q' \restriction [\beta, \kappa).\text{”}\end{gathered}$$

Claim 1: $p \Vdash$ “$s \le q$ and $s \Vdash$ ‘$T \subseteq H$.’”

Proof: Suppose $p' \le p$. Fix $p^* \le p'$ and $\beta_0 < \kappa$ such that $p^* \Vdash$ “$\beta_0 = \beta$.” Because the name β is in N and p^* is N-generic, we have that $\beta_0 \in N$. Notice by the induction hypothesis we have

$$\begin{gathered}p \Vdash \text{“there is some } q^\# \le q' \restriction \beta_0 \text{ and some } z\text{-sized tree } H^\# \\ \text{such that } q^\# \Vdash \text{‘}T' \subseteq H^\#.\text{’”}\end{gathered}$$

Hence

$$\begin{gathered}p^* \Vdash \text{“}q^* = q^*(\beta_0) \le q' \restriction \beta \text{ and } H = H(\beta_0) \text{ and } H \text{ is a } z\text{-sized tree and} \\ q^* \Vdash \text{‘}T' \subseteq H \text{ and } q' \restriction [\beta, \kappa) \Vdash \text{“}T' = T.\text{” ’”}\end{gathered}$$

Therefore $p^* \Vdash$ “$s \Vdash$ ‘$T \subseteq H$.’”

Claim 1 is established. This completes Case 2.

Case 3. $\operatorname{cf}(\kappa) = \omega$.

Let $\langle \alpha_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ be an increasing sequence from $\kappa \cap N$ cofinal in κ such that $\alpha_0 = \alpha$.

Define $y \in {}^{\omega}(\omega - \{0\})$ by letting $y(n)$ be the greatest integer less than or equal to $z(n)/x(n)$ for every $n \in \omega$.

In $V[G_{P_\alpha}]$, let $\langle \mathcal{T}_n(x) : n \in \omega \rangle$ and $\mathcal{T}(x)$ be as in the proof of Lemma 4.6. Also in $V[G_{P_\alpha}]$, fix an isomorphism of ${}^{<\omega}\omega$ onto $\mathcal{T}(x)$ and implicitly fix a P_α-name for the isomorphism that is an element of N.

Let ζ be a P_κ-name in N such that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\kappa}$ "$\zeta \in [\mathcal{T}(x)]$ and for every $n \in \omega$ we have $\zeta(n) = T \cap {}^{\leq n}\omega$."

Fix $\langle (p_n, \zeta_n) : n \in \omega \rangle \in N$ as in Lemma 3.1 applied in $V[G_{P_\alpha}]$ (that is, the sequence of names is an element of N but not necessarily their values). That is, we have $\mathbf{1} \Vdash$ "$p_0 \leq q$" and for every $n \in \omega$ we have that each of the following holds:

(0) p_n is a P_α-name for an element of $P_{\alpha,\kappa}$.

(1) For every $k \leq n$ we have $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_{\alpha_n}}$ "$p_0 \restriction [\alpha_n, \kappa) \Vdash$ '$\zeta \restriction k = \zeta_n \restriction k$.' "

(2) ζ_n is a P_{α_n}-name for an element of $[\mathcal{T}(x)]$.

(3) $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_{\alpha_n}}$ "$p_0 \restriction [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}) \Vdash$ '$\zeta_n \restriction k = \zeta_{n+1} \restriction k$ for every $k \leq n + 1$.' "

(4) $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\alpha}$ "$p_{n+1} \leq p_n$."

(5) Whenever $k \leq m < \omega$ we have $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_{\alpha_n}}$ "$p_m \restriction [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}) \Vdash$ '$\zeta_n \restriction k = \zeta_{n+1} \restriction k$.' "

Claim 2. Suppose $\alpha \leq \beta \leq \gamma < \kappa$ and $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\alpha}$ "$x' \ll z'$" and suppose T' is a P_γ-name for an x'-sized tree. Then

$$\begin{gathered} \mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\beta} \text{“}V[G_{P_\alpha}] \models \text{‘}(\forall q \in P_{\beta,\gamma})(\exists q' \leq q)(\exists H) \\ (H \text{ is a } z'\text{-sized tree and } q' \Vdash \text{“}T' \subseteq H\text{”}).\text{’”} \end{gathered}$$

Proof: Given $r_1 \in P_\alpha$ and a P_α-name r_2 for an element of $P_{\alpha,\beta}$ and a P_β-name q for an element of $P_{\beta,\gamma} \cap V[G_{P_\alpha}]$, choose λ' a sufficiently large regular cardinal and N' a countable elementary substructure of $H_{\lambda'}$ containing $\{r_1, r_2, q, P_\kappa, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, x', z', T'\}$. Choose $r_1' \leq r_1$ such that r_1' is N'-generic. By the overall induction hypothesis (i.e., because $\gamma < \kappa$) we may choose s such that

$$r_1' \Vdash \text{“}s \leq (r_2, q) \text{ and } (\exists H)(H \text{ is a } z'\text{-sized tree and } s \Vdash \text{‘}T' \subseteq H\text{’}).\text{”}$$

Consequently we may choose H such that

$$\begin{gathered} (r_1', s \restriction \beta) \Vdash \text{“}V[G_{P_\alpha}] \models \text{‘}s \restriction [\beta, \gamma) \leq q \text{ and } H \text{ is a } z'\text{-sized tree and} \\ s \restriction [\beta, \gamma) \Vdash \text{“}T' \subseteq H\text{”}).\text{’”} \end{gathered}$$

The Claim is established.

In $V[G_{P_\alpha}]$ fix $y' \ll y$ such that $1 \ll y'$. We may assume that the name y' is in N.

Let $\Omega = \{x' \in N : x'$ is a P_α-name and $\mathbf{1} \Vdash$ "$1 \ll x' \ll y'$"$\}$. Let $\langle y_n : n \in \omega\rangle$ enumerate Ω. Build $\langle x^*_n : n \in \omega\rangle$ as follows. Let $x^*_0 = y_0$, and for each $n \in \omega$ choose $x^*_{n+1} \in \Omega$ such that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash$ "$x^*_n \ll x^*_{n+1}$ and $y_{n+1} \ll x^*_{n+1}$." Also build $\langle x_n : n \in \omega\rangle$ a sequence of elements of Ω such that for each $n \in \omega$ we have $x^*_n \ll x_n \ll x^*_{n+1}$.

For each $n \in \omega$ let $\langle T_{n,j} : j \in \omega\rangle$ list all P_α-names $T' \in N$ such that in $V[G_{P_\alpha}]$ there is some $y' \ll x^*_{n+1}$ such that $T' \subseteq \mathcal{T}(x)$ is a y'-sized tree, and build $\langle x_{n,j} : j \in \omega\rangle$ a sequence of elements of Ω such that for every $j \in \omega$ we have in $V[G_P]$ that $x_n \ll x_{n,j} \ll x_{n,j+1} \ll x^*_{n+1}$ and $T_{n,j} \subseteq \mathcal{T}(x)$ is an $x_{n,j}$-sized tree.

Using Lemma 4.9, choose $T^* \subseteq \mathcal{T}(x)$ a y-sized tree and $\langle T^n : n \in \omega\rangle \in V[G_{P_\alpha}]$ a sequence of subsets of $\mathcal{T}(x)$ such that $T^* \in V[G_{P_\alpha}]$ and $T^0 \subseteq T^*$ and $\zeta_0 \in [T^0]$ and for every $n \in \omega$ we have that T^n is an x_n-sized tree and $T^n \subseteq T^{n+1}$ and, in $V[G_{P_\kappa}]$, we have that for every $j \in \omega$ and every $g \in [T_{n,j}]$ there is $k \in \omega$ such that for every $\eta \in T_{n,j}$ extending $g \restriction k$, if $\eta \restriction k \in T^n \cap T^*$ then $\eta \in T^{n+1} \cap T^*$. We may assume the P_α-names T^* and $\langle T^n : n \in \omega\rangle$ are in N.

Note that the reason we worked in $V[G_{P_\kappa}]$ rather then in $V[G_{P_\alpha}]$ in the previous paragraph is because we wish to allow g to range over $[T_{n,j}]$ with the brackets interpreted in $V[G_{P_\kappa}]$ (i.e., g need not be in $V[G_{P_\alpha}]$).

Using Claim 2, for every $n \in \omega$, let $F_{n,0}$ and $F_{n,2}$ and y^*_n be P_{α_n}-names such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{(A) } \mathbf{1} \Vdash \text{"}F_{n,0} \text{ and } F_{n,2} \text{ and } y^*_n \text{ are functions, all three of which are in } V[G_{P_\alpha}],\\
&\qquad \text{and each of whose domains is equal to } P_{\alpha_n,\alpha_{n+1}}, \text{ such that}\\
&\qquad (\forall q' \in P_{\alpha_n,\alpha_{n+1}} \cap V[G_{P_\alpha}])(F_{n,0}(q') \subseteq \mathcal{T}(x) \text{ is a } y^*_n(q')\text{-sized tree}\\
&\qquad\qquad \text{and } y^*_n(q') \ll x^*_{n+1} \text{ and } F_{n,2}(q') \le q'\\
&\qquad\qquad \text{and } F_{n,2}(q') \Vdash \text{`}\zeta_{n+1} \in [F_{n,0}(q')]\text{'}).\text{"}
\end{aligned}$$

We may assume that the names $F_{n,0}$ and $F_{n,2}$ and y^*_n are in N.

For each $n \in \omega$ we may, in $V[G_{P_{\alpha_n}}]$, use Lemma 4.8 to choose $y_n \ll x_{n+1}$ and $\tilde{T}_n \subseteq \mathcal{T}(x)$ a y_n-sized tree and $\langle k^n_i : i \in \omega\rangle$ an increasing sequence of integers such that $T^n \subseteq \tilde{T}_n$ and for every $\eta \in T^n$ and every $i \in \omega$ and every $\nu \in F_{n,0}(p_{k^n_i} \restriction [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}))$, if length$(\eta) \ge k^n_i$ and ν extends η, then $\nu \in \tilde{T}_n$.

We may assume the P_{α_n}-names $\tilde{T}_n$ and $\langle k^n_i : i \in \omega\rangle$ are in N.

Claim 3. We may be build $\langle r_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ such that $r_0 = p$ and for every $n \in \omega$ we have that the following hold:

(1) $r_n \in P_{\alpha_n}$ is N-generic, and

(2) $r_{n+1} \upharpoonright \alpha_n = r_n$, and

(3) $r_n \Vdash$ "$\zeta_n \in [T^n] \cap [T^*]$," and

(4) $p \Vdash$ "$r_n \upharpoonright [\alpha, \alpha_n) \leq p_0 \upharpoonright \alpha_n$."

Proof: By induction on n. For $n = 0$ we have nothing to prove. Suppose we have r_n.

By (A) and the definition of $\tilde{T}_n$ we have that

(B) $r_n \Vdash$ "$T^n \subseteq \tilde{T}_n$ "

and

(C) $r_n \Vdash$ "for every $\eta \in T^n$ and every $i \in \omega$ and every $\nu \in F_{n,0}(p_{k_i^n} \upharpoonright [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}))$, if length$(\eta) \geq k_i^n$ and ν extends η then $\nu \in \tilde{T}_n$."

By (C) and the fact that, by the induction hypothesis, we know $r_n \Vdash$ "$\zeta_n \in [T^n]$," we have that

(D) $r_n \Vdash$ "$(\forall j \in \omega)(F_{n,2}(p_{k_j^n} \upharpoonright [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1})) \Vdash$ '$(\forall \nu \in F_{n,0}(p_{k_j^n} \upharpoonright [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1})))$(if ν extends $\zeta_n \upharpoonright k_j^n$ then $\nu \in \tilde{T}_n$))' ."

We have

$$r_n \Vdash \text{“}\tilde{T}_n \in N[G_{P_{\alpha_n}}].\text{”}$$

We also have

$$r_n \Vdash \text{“}\tilde{T}_n \in V[G_{P_\alpha}].\text{”}$$

Therefore, because r_n is N-generic, we have

$$r_n \Vdash \text{“}\tilde{T}_n \in N[G_{P_\alpha}].\text{”}$$

Therefore there is a P_{α_n}-name m such that

$$r_n \Vdash \text{“}\tilde{T}_n = T_{n,m}.\text{”}$$

Using this fact along with the fact that $\langle T^n : n \in \omega \rangle$ and T^* were chosen as in the conclusion of Lemma 4.9 and also using the fact that $r_n \Vdash$ "$\zeta_n \in [T^n] \subseteq [\tilde{T}_n]$," we may choose k to be a P_{α_n}-name for an integer such that

(E) $r_n \Vdash$ "$(\forall \eta \in \tilde{T}_n)$(if η extends $\zeta_n \upharpoonright k$ and $\eta \upharpoonright k \in T^n \cap T^*$ then $\eta \in T^{n+1} \cap T^*$)."

Choose j to be a P_{α_n}-name for an integer such that $r_n \Vdash$ "$k^n_j \geq k$."

Subclaim 1. $r_n \Vdash$ "$F_{n,2}(p_{k^n_j}\restriction[\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1})) \Vdash$ '$\zeta_{n+1} \in [\tilde{T}_n]$.' "

Proof. It suffices to show

$r_n \Vdash$ "$F_{n,2}(p_{k^n_j}\restriction[\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1})) \Vdash$ '$(\forall j' > j)(\zeta_{n+1}\restriction k^n_{j'} \in \tilde{T}_n)$.' "

Fix j' a $P_{\alpha_{n+1}}$-name for an integer such that

$r_n \Vdash$ "$F_{n,2}(p_{k^n_j}\restriction[\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1})) \Vdash j' > j$.' "

We know by the induction hypothesis that $r_n \Vdash$ "$\zeta_n \in [T^n]$." Therefore

(F) $r_n \Vdash$ "$\zeta_n\restriction k^n_j \in T^n$."

By the definition of $\langle p_i : i \in \omega\rangle$, we have

(G) $r_n \Vdash$ "$p_{k^n_j}\restriction[\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}) \Vdash$ '$\zeta_n\restriction k^n_j = \zeta_{n+1}\restriction k^n_j$.' "

By (A) we have

(H) $r_n \Vdash$ "$F_{n,2}(p_{k^n_j}\restriction[\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1})) \Vdash$ '$\zeta_{n+1} \in [F_{n,0}(p_{k^n_j}\restriction[\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}))]$.' "

Combining (G), (H), the definition of $\tilde{T}_n$, we have that

$$r_n \Vdash \text{“}F_{n,2}(p_{k^n_j}\restriction[\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1})) \Vdash \text{‘}\zeta_{n+1}\restriction k^n_{j'} \in \tilde{T}_n.\text{’”}$$

The Subclaim is established.

Subclaim 2. $r_n \Vdash$ "$F_{n,2}(p_{k^n_j}\restriction[\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1})) \Vdash$ '$\zeta_{n+1} \in [T^{n+1}] \cap [T^*]$.' "

Proof: By (E) we have

(I) $r_n \Vdash$ "$(\forall \eta \in \tilde{T}_n)$(if η extends $\zeta_n\restriction k^n_j$ and $\eta\restriction k^n_j \in T^n \cap T^*$ then $\eta \in T^{n+1} \cap T^*$)."

Work in $V[G_{P_{\alpha_n}}]$ with $r_n \in G_{P_{\alpha_n}}$. Fix $\eta \in \tilde{T}_n$ and suppose

$F_{n,2}(p_{k^n_j}\restriction[\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1})) \Vdash$ "η is an initial segment of ζ_{n+1} with $\mathrm{lh}(\eta) \geq k^n_j$."

To establish the Subclaim, it suffices to show

(J) $F_{n,2}(p_{k^n_j}\restriction\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1})) \Vdash$ "$\eta \in T^{n+1} \cap T^*$."

By the definition of $\langle p_i : i \in \omega\rangle$ we have

$$p_{k^n_j}\restriction[\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}) \Vdash \text{“}\eta\restriction k^n_j = \zeta_{n+1}\restriction k^n_j = \zeta_n\restriction k^n_j.\text{”}$$

Hence by the fact that Claim 3 holds for the integer n we have

(K) $p_{k^n_j}\restriction[\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1})) \Vdash$ "$\eta\restriction k^n_j \in T^n \cap T^*$."

By Subclaim 1, (I), (K), and the fact that $F_2(p_{k_j^n}\restriction[\alpha_n,\alpha_{n+1})) \leq p_{k_j^n}\restriction[\alpha_n,\alpha_{n+1})$ we obtain (J).

Subclaim 2 is established.

To complete the induction establishing Claim 3, we use the Proper Iteration Lemma to take $r_{n+1} \in P_{\alpha_{n+1}}$ such that $r_{n+1}\restriction\alpha_n = r_n$ and r_{n+1} is N-generic and $r_n \Vdash$ "$r_{n+1}\restriction[\alpha_n,\alpha_{n+1}) \leq F_{n,2}(p_{k_j^n}\restriction[\alpha_n,\alpha_{n+1}))$."

Claim 3 is established.

Let q' be a P_α-name such that

$$p \Vdash \text{“}q' = \bigcup\{r_n\restriction[\alpha,\alpha_n) : n \in \omega\}.\text{”}$$

In $V[G_{P_\alpha}]$, let $H^* = \bigcup T^*$ and let

$$H = \{\nu \in H^* : (\forall n \in \omega)(\exists \eta \in H^*)(\nu \text{ is comparable with } \eta)\}.$$

As in the proof of Lemma 4.6, we have that H is a z-sized tree. By Claim 3 we have that

$$\begin{aligned} q' \Vdash \text{“for every } n \in \omega \text{ we have } \zeta_n \in [T^*] \text{ and } \zeta_n\restriction n = \zeta\restriction n,\\ \text{and therefore } \zeta \in [T^*], \text{ and therefore } T \subseteq H.\text{”}\end{aligned}$$

The Theorem is established.

Corollary 4.11. *Suppose $\langle P_\eta : \eta \leq \kappa\rangle$ is a countable support iteration based on $\langle Q_\eta : \eta < \kappa\rangle$ and suppose $(\forall \eta < \kappa)(\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\eta}$ "Q_η is proper and has the Sacks proeprty.") Then P_κ has the Sacks property.*

Proof. Take $\alpha = 0$ in Theorem 4.10.

5 The Laver Property

In this section, we present Shelah's proof that the Laver property is preserved by countable support iteration of proper forcing.

Definition 5.1. *Suppose $f \in {}^\omega(\omega - \{0\})$ and $\mathbf{1} \ll f$. We say that T is an f-tree iff T is a tree and $(\forall \eta \in T)(\forall n \in \mathrm{dom}(\eta))(\eta(n) < f(n))$.*

Definition 5.2. *We say that P is f-preserving iff whenever z is in ${}^\omega(\omega - \{0\})$ and $1 \ll z$ then*

$\mathbf{1} \Vdash_P$ "$(\forall g \in {}^\omega\omega)(g \leq f$ implies there exists $H \in V$ such that H is a z-sized f-tree and $g \in [H])$."

Definition 5.3. *We say that P has the Laver property iff for every $f \in {}^{\omega}(\omega - \{0\})$ such that $\mathbf{1} \ll f$ we have that P is f-preserving.*

Theorem 5.4. *P has the Sacks property iff P has the Laver property and P is ${}^{\omega}\omega$-bounding.*

Proof: We first assume that P has the Sacks property and we show that P is ${}^{\omega}\omega$-bounding. Given $p \in P$ and a name f such that $p \Vdash$ "$f \in {}^{\omega}\omega$," take $z \in {}^{\omega}(\omega - \{0\})$ such that $\mathbf{1} \ll z$ and use the fact that P has the Sacks property to obtain $q \leq p$ and a z-sized tree H such that $q \Vdash$ "$f \in [H]$." For every $n \in \omega$ let

$$g(n) = \max\{\eta(n) : \eta \in H \text{ and } \mathrm{lh}(\eta) > n\}.$$

Then we have $q \Vdash$ "$f \leq g$." This establishes the fact that P is ${}^{\omega}\omega$-bounding.

It is clear that if P has the Sacks property, then it has the Laver property.

Finally we assume that P has the Laver property and is ${}^{\omega}\omega$-bounding, and we show that P has the Sacks property. So suppose that $p \in P$ and $\mathbf{1} \ll z$ and $p \Vdash$ "$g \in {}^{\omega}\omega$." Using the fact that P is ${}^{\omega}\omega$-bounding, take $p' \leq p$ and $f \in {}^{\omega}\omega$ such that $p' \Vdash$ "$g \leq f$." Using the fact that P has the Laver property, take $q \leq p'$ and H a P-name such that

$$q \Vdash \text{“}H \text{ is a } z\text{-sized } f\text{-tree and } g \in [H] \text{ and } H \in V.\text{”}$$

The Theorem is established.

Theorem 5.5. *Suppose $\langle P_\eta : \eta \leq \kappa \rangle$ is a countable support iteration based on $\langle Q_\eta : \eta < \kappa \rangle$ and suppose $(\forall \eta < \kappa)(\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\eta}$ "Q_η is proper and has the Laver property.") Then P_κ has the Laver property.*

Proof: Fix $f \in {}^{\omega}\omega$ such that $\mathbf{1} \ll f$. Repeat the proofs of Lemma 4.5 through Corollary 4.11 with "tree" replaced by "f-tree." The Theorem is established.

6 (f, g)-bounding

In this section we establish the preservation of (f, g)-bounding forcing. For an exact formulation, see Corollary 6.8 below. This proof is due to Shelah, of course; see [12, Conclusion VI.2.11F].

Definition 6.1. *We say that T is an (f,g)-corseted tree iff*

(0) $T \subseteq {}^{<\omega}\omega$ is a tree, and
(1) f and g are functions with domain ω, and
(2) $(\forall n \in \omega)(f(n) \in \{r \in \mathbf{R} : 1 < r\} \cup \{\omega\})$, and
(3) $(\forall n \in \omega)(g(n) \in \{r \in \mathbf{R} : 1 < r\} \cup \{\aleph_0\})$, and
(4) $(\forall k \in \omega)(\exists m \in \omega)(\forall j \geq m)(k < f(j)$ and $k < g(j))$, and
(5) $(\forall \eta \in T)(\forall i \in \mathrm{dom}(\eta))(\eta(i) < f(i))$, and
(6) $(\forall n \in \omega)(|\{\eta(n) : \eta \in T$ and $n \in \mathrm{dom}(\eta)\}| \leq g(n))$.

Definition 6.2. *Suppose that f and g are functions as in Definition 6.1. We say that P is (f,g)-bounding iff* $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_P$ "$(\forall h \in {}^{\omega}\omega)[(\forall n \in \omega)(h(n) < f(n))$ implies $(\exists T \in V)(T$ is an (f,g)-corseted tree and $h \in [T])]$."

Lemma 6.3. *Suppose P is $(f^{g^k}, g^{1/k})$-bounding for infinitely many $k \in \omega$, and suppose $x < z$ are positive rational numbers. Suppose $\gamma \in \omega$ and* $\mathbf{1} \Vdash$ "T is an (f^{g^γ}, g^x)-corseted tree." *Then* $\mathbf{1} \Vdash$ "$(\exists H \in V)(H$ *is an* (f^{g^γ}, g^z)*-corseted tree and* $T \subseteq H)$."

Proof. Fix an integer k such that $k > x$ and P is $(f^{g^{\gamma+k}}, g^{1/(\gamma+k)})$-bounding and $k > 1/(z-x)$. Let $X = \{n \in \omega : g(n) = \aleph_0\}$.

For every $m \in \omega - X$ define

$$\mathcal{T}_m = \{S \subseteq \omega : \sup(S) \leq f(m)^{g(m)^\gamma} \text{ and } |S| < g(m)^x\}.$$

For every $m \in \omega - X$ define

$$\mathcal{T}'_m = \{i \in \omega : i \leq f(m)^{g(m)^{\gamma+k}}\}.$$

Because $x < k$ we may choose, for each integer m not in X, a one-to-one mapping h_m from $\mathcal{T}_m$ into $\mathcal{T}'_m$.

Define

$$\mathcal{T} = \{\xi \in {}^{<\omega}\omega : (\forall m \in \omega - X)(\xi(m) \in \mathcal{T}'_m) \\ \text{and } (\forall m \in X)(\xi(m) = 1)\}.$$

In $V[G_P]$ let $\zeta \in [\mathcal{T}]$ denote the function defined by

$$(\forall m \in \omega - X)(\zeta(m) = h_m(\{\eta(m) : \eta \in T \text{ and } m \in \mathrm{dom}(\eta)\})) \\ \text{and } (\forall m \in X)(\zeta(m) = 1).$$

Because P is $(f^{g^{\gamma+k}}, g^{1/(\gamma+k)})$-bounding, we may take $H' \in V$ such that H' is an $(f^{g^{\gamma+k}}, g^{1/(\gamma+k)})$-corseted tree and $\zeta \in [H']$. Define H^* by

$$H^*(m) = \bigcup\{h_m^{-1}(t) : (\exists \eta \in H')(t = \eta(m)) \text{ and } t \in \text{range}(h_m)\} \text{ for } m \in \omega - X,$$
$$\text{and } H^*(m) = \omega \text{ for } m \in X.$$

When $g(m)$ is finite, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |H^*(m)| &\leq |H'(m)| \cdot \max\{|h_m^{-1}(t) : t \in \text{range}(h_m)|\} \\ &\leq g^x(m) \cdot g^{1/(\gamma+k)}(m) < g^z(m). \end{aligned}$$

Let $H = \{\eta \in {}^{<\omega}\omega : (\forall i \in \text{dom}(\eta))(\eta(i) \in H^*(i))\}$. We have that H is an (f^{g^γ}, g^z)-corseted tree and $\mathbf{1} \Vdash$ "$T \subseteq H$." The Lemma is established.

Lemmma 6.4. *Suppose* $n^* \in \omega$. *Suppose* P *is a forcing such that* $V[G_P] \models$ "for every countable $X \subseteq V$ there is a countable $Y \in V$ such that $X \subseteq Y$." *Suppose* $V[G_P] \models$ "$\langle r_n : n \in \omega\rangle$ is a bounded sequence of positive rational numbers and $y \in \mathbf{Q}$ and $\sup\{r_n : n \in \omega\} < y$ and $(\forall n \in \omega)(T_n \in V$ is an (f, g^{r_n})-corseted tree)." *Then in* $V[G_P]$ *there is an* (f, g^y)*-corseted tree* $T^* \in V$ *and an increasing sequence of integers* $\langle k_n : n \in \omega\rangle$ *such that* $k_0 = 0$ *and* $k_1 \geq n^*$ *and* $(\forall i > 0)$ $(i < k_i)$ *and for every* $\eta \in {}^{<\omega}\omega$ *we have*

$$(\forall t \in \text{dom}(\eta))(\exists j \in \omega)(\exists \nu \in T_{k_j})(k_j \leq t \text{ and } \nu(t) = \eta(t))$$
$$\text{implies } \eta \in T^*.$$

Proof: The proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 4.7. We note the following modifications. We must choose $x \in \mathbf{Q}$ such that $\sup\{r_n : n \in \omega\} < x < y$. By recursion choose $\langle k_n : n \in \omega\rangle$ an increasing sequence of integers such that $k_0 = 0$ and $k_1 \geq n^*$ and $(\forall n > 0)(\exists j \in \omega)(k_n \leq j$ implies $(n+1)g(j)^x \leq g(j)^y)$.

The definition of T^* is changed to $T^* = \{\eta \in {}^{<\omega}\omega : (\forall t \in \text{dom}(\eta))(\exists j \in \omega)(\exists \nu \in S'_{k_j})(k_j \leq t \text{ and } \nu(t) = \eta(t))\}$.

Clearly T^* is a tree.

Claim. T^* is an (f, g^y)-corseted tree.

Proof: Fix $t \in \omega$.

Case 1: $t \geq k_1$.

Choose $m \in \omega$ such that $k_m \leq t < k_{m+1}$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} |\{\eta(t) : \eta \in T^* \text{ and } t \in \text{dom}(\eta)\}| &= \Sigma_{j \leq m}|\{\eta(t) : \eta \in T_{k_j} \text{ and } t \in \text{dom}(\eta)\}| \\ &\leq (m+1)g^x(t) \leq g^y(t). \end{aligned}$$

Case 2: $t < k_1$.

We have $\{\eta(t) : \eta \in T^*\} = \{\eta(t) : \eta \in T\}$, so it follows that $|H(t)| \leq g^y(t)$.

The Claim is established.

The other requirements of the Lemma are the same as in the proof of Lemma 4.7. The Lemma is established.

Lemma 6.5. *Suppose $x < z$ are positive rational numbers, and suppose* $(\forall n \in \omega)(T_n$ is an (f, g^x)-corseted tree). *Suppose T is an (f, g^x)-corseted tree. Then there is an (f, g^z)-corseted tree $T^* \supseteq T$ and an increasing sequence of integers $\langle m_i : i \in \omega \rangle$ such that for all $\eta \in T$ and all $i \in \omega$ and all $\nu \in T_{m_i}$ extending η, if* $\mathrm{lh}(\eta) \geq m_i$, *then $\nu \in T^*$.*

Proof. Choose a rational number y such that $x < y < z$. Choose $n^* \in \omega$ such that $(\forall n \geq n^*)(2g^x(n) \leq g^y(n))$.

For every $n \geq n^*$ define $T'_n = \{\eta \in {}^{<\omega}\omega : \eta \in T$ or $\eta \in T_n$ and $\eta \restriction n \in T\}$. For every $n < n^*$ set $T'_n = T$.

It is easy to see that for every n we have that T'_n is an (f, g^y)-corseted tree.

By Lemma 6.4, we may take T^* an (f, g^z)-corseted tree, and an increasing sequence of integers $\langle k_i : i \in \omega \rangle$, such that $k_0 = 0$ and $k_1 \geq n^*$ and $(\forall i > 0)$ $(k_i > i)$ and for every $\eta \in {}^{<\omega}\omega$ we have

$$(\forall t \in \mathrm{dom}(\eta))(\exists j \in \omega)(\exists \zeta \in T'_{k_j})(k_j \leq t \text{ and } \zeta(t) = \eta(t))$$
$$\text{implies } \eta \in T^*.$$

It is clear that $T \subseteq T^*$.

For every $i \in \omega$ set $m_i = k_{i+1}$.

Now suppose $\eta \in T$ and $i \in \omega$ and $\mathrm{lh}(\eta) \geq m_i$ and $\nu \in T_{m_i}$ and ν extends η. Because ν extends an element of T of length at least m_i, we have that $\nu \in T'_{m_i}$. Choose $h \in [T'_{m_i}]$ such that ν is an initial segment of h. It suffices to show that $h \in [T^*]$. Therefore it suffices to show that for every $t \in \omega$ that the following holds:

$(*)_t$ $(\exists j \in \omega)(\exists \zeta \in T'_{k_j})(k_j \leq t$ and $\zeta(t) = h(t))$

Fix $t \in \omega$.

Fix $m^* \in \omega$ such that $k_{m^*} \leq t < k_{m^*+1}$.

Case 1: $i < m^*$.

To see that $(*)_t$ holds, set $j = m^*$ and $\zeta = h \restriction k_{m^*}$. We have $h \in [T'_{k_{i+1}}] \subseteq [T'_{k_{m^*}}]$, so $\zeta \in T'_{k_j}$ and $k_j \leq t$. This completes Case 1.

Case 2: $m^* \leq i$.

We have $\eta \in T = T'_0$. Set $\zeta = \eta$ and $j = 0$. Because h extends η we have $\zeta(t) = h(t)$, and so $(*)_t$ holds. This completes Case 2.

The Lemma is established.

Lemma 6.6. *Suppose* y *and* z *are positive rational numbers, and suppose* $\langle x_n : n \in \omega\rangle$ *is a sequence of positive rational numbers such that* $(\forall n \in \omega)(x_n < x_{n+1} < y < z)$. *Suppose* T *is an* (f, g^{x_0})*-corseted tree. Suppose for every* $n \in \omega$, *we have* $x_n^* \in \mathbf{Q}$ *and* $x_n^* < x_n < x_{n+1}^*$, *and for each* $n \in \omega$ *we have* $\langle x_{n,j} : n \in \omega\rangle$ *is a sequence of rational numbers such that for every* $j \in \omega$ *we have* $x_n < x_{n,j} < x_{n,j+1} < x_{n+1}^*$. *Suppose* $\langle T_{n,j} : n \in \omega,\ j \in \omega\rangle$ *is a sequence such that for every* $n \in \omega$ *and* $j \in \omega$ *we have that* $T_{n,j}$ *is an* $(f, g^{x_{n,j}})$*-corseted tree. Then there are* $\langle T^n : n \in \omega\rangle$ *and* T^* *such that* T^* *is an* (f, g^z)*-corseted tree and for every forcing notion* P *we have in* $V[G_P]$ *that* $T \subseteq T^*$ *and for every* $n \in \omega$ *we have*

(i) $T^n \subseteq T^{n+1}$ and T^n is an (f, g^{x_n})-corseted tree, and

(ii) for every $j \in \omega$ and every $g \in [T_{n,j}] \cap V[G_P]$ there is $k \in \omega$ such that for every $\eta \in T_{n,j}$ extending $g{\restriction}k$, if $\eta{\restriction}k \in T^n \cap T^*$ then $\eta \in T^{n+1} \cap T^*$.

Proof: Let $T^0 = T$. Given T^n, build $\langle T'_{n,j} : j \in \omega\rangle$ as follows. Let $T'_{n,0} = T^n$. Given $T'_{n,j}$ choose $m(n,j) \in \omega$ such that

$$(\forall t \geq m(n,j))(2g^{x_{n,j}}(t) \leq g^{x_{n,j+1}}(t)).$$

Set

$$T'_{n,j+1} = T'_{n,j} \cup \{\eta \in T_{n,j} : \eta{\restriction}m(n,j) \in T'_{n,j}\}.$$

Claim 1. Whenever $i \leq j < \omega$ we have $T'_{n,i} \subseteq T'_{n,j}$.

Proof. Clear.

Claim 2. Suppose T^n is an (f, g^{x_n})-corseted tree. Then $(\forall j \in \omega)(T'_{n,j}$ is an $(f, g^{x_{n,j}})$-corseted tree).

Proof: It is clear that $T'_{n,0}$ is an $(f, g^{x_{n,0}})$-corseted tree. Assume that $T'_{n,j}$ is an $(f, g^{x_{n,j}})$-corseted tree. Fix $t \in \omega$.

Case 1: $t < m(n,j)$.

We have that $\{\eta(t) : t \in T'_{n,j+1}$ and $t \in \mathrm{dom}(\eta)\} = \{\eta(t) : \eta \in T'_{n,j}$ and $t \in \mathrm{dom}(\eta)\}$ and so

$$|\{\eta(t) : t \in T'_{n,j+1} \text{ and } t \in \mathrm{dom}(\eta)\}| \leq g^{x_{n,j}}(t) \leq g^{x_{n,j+1}}(t).$$

Case 2: $t \geq m(n,j)$.

We have $\{\eta(t) : t \in T'_{n,j+1}$ and $t \in \mathrm{dom}(\eta)\} \subseteq (\{\eta(t) : t \in T'_{n,j}$ and $t \in \mathrm{dom}(\eta)\} \cup \{\eta(t) : t \in T_{n,j}$ and $t \in \mathrm{dom}(\eta)\})$. Therefore we have

$$|\{\eta(t) : t \in T'_{n,j+1} \text{ and } t \in \mathrm{dom}(\eta)\}| \leq 2g^{x_{n,j}}(t) \leq g^{x_{n,j+1}}(t).$$

The Claim is established.

For each $n \in \omega$, using Claim 2 and Lemma 6.4 we my find an increasing sequence of integers $\langle k_{n,j} : j \in \omega\rangle$ and T^{n+1} such that $k_{n,0} = 0$ and $(\forall j > 0)$ $(k_{n,j} > j)$ and if T^n is an (f, g^{x_n})-corseted tree, then T^{n+1} is an $(f, g^{x_{n+1}})$-corseted tree such that for all $\eta \in {}^{<\omega}\omega$, we have

$$(\forall t \in \mathrm{dom}(\eta))(\exists j \in \omega)(\exists \eta' \in T'_{n,k_{n,j}})(k_{n,j} \leq t \text{ and } \eta(t) = \eta'(t))$$
$$\text{implies } \eta \in T^{n+1}.$$

This completes the construction of $\langle T^n : n \in \omega\rangle$ and $\langle T_{n,j} : j \in \omega,\, n \in \omega\rangle$.

Applying mathematical induction, we have that each T^n is in fact an (f, g^{x_n})-corseted tree.

Claim 3. $T^n \subseteq T^{n+1}$ for every $n \in \omega$.

Proof: By Claim 1 we have that $T^n \subseteq T'_{n,i}$ for every $i \in \omega$. By the definition of T^{n+1} we have that $T^{n+1} \supseteq \bigcap\{T'_{n,k_{n,i}} : i \in \omega\} \supseteq \bigcap\{T'_{n,i} : i \in \omega\} \supseteq T^n$. The Claim is established.

Applying Lemma 6.4 again we obtain an increasing sequence of integers $\langle k_n : n \in \omega\rangle$ and a (f, g^z)-corseted tree T^* such that $k_0 = 0$ and $(\forall n > 0)(n < k_n)$ and for every $\eta \in {}^{<\omega}\omega$, we have that

$$(\forall t \in \mathrm{dom}(\eta))(\exists j \in \omega)(\exists \eta' \in T^{k_j})(k_j \leq t \text{ and } \eta(t) = \eta'(t))$$
$$\text{implies } \eta \in T^*.$$

Notice that $T^0 \subseteq \bigcap\{T^n : n \in \omega\} \subseteq T^*$.

Now we verify that $\langle T^n : n \in \omega\rangle$ and T^* satisfy the remaining conclusions of the Lemma. Accordingly, fix P a forcing notion and work in $VG_P]$. Fix $n \in \omega$ and $j \in \omega$ and $g \in [T_{n,j}]$. Let

$$k = \max(k_{n+1}, \max\{k_{n,j'} : j' \leq j+1\}, \max\{m(n, j') : j' \leq j+1\}).$$

Fix $\eta \in T_{n,j}$ extending $g \restriction k$ and assume that $\eta \restriction k \in T^n \cap T^*$.

Claim 4. $\eta \in T^{n+1}$.

Fix $t \in \mathrm{dom}(\eta)$.

Let j' be the unique integer such that $k_{n,j'} \leq t < k_{n,j'+1}$.

It suffices to show

$(*)_t$ $(\exists j^* \leq j')(\exists \eta' \in T'_{n,k_{n,j^*}})(\eta(t) = \eta'(t))$.

Case 1: $j > j'$.

Let $\eta' = \eta\restriction k_{n,j'+1}$ and let $j^* = j'$. Because η' is an initial segment of $\eta\restriction k \in T^n \subseteq T'_{n,k_{n,j'}}$, we have that $(*)_t$ holds.

Case 2: $j \leq j'$.

Let $\eta' = \eta$ and $j^* = j$. Because $m(n,j) \leq k$ and $g\restriction k = \eta\restriction k \in T^n$, we have $g\restriction m(n,j) \in T^n \subseteq T'_{n,j}$. Because we also have $\eta \in T_{n,j}$, we conclude that $\eta' \in T'_{n,j+1} \subseteq T'_{n,k_{n,j}}$. It is easy to see that $(*)_t$ holds.

Claim 4 is established.

Claim 5. $\eta \in T^*$.

Fix $t \in \mathrm{dom}(\eta)$.

Let i be the unique integer such that $k_i \leq t < k_{i+1}$.

It suffices to show

$$(\exists i' \leq i)(\exists \eta' \in T^{k_{i'}})(\eta(t) = \eta'(t)).$$

Case 1: $i < n$.

Because $\eta\restriction k \in T^*$ we have $g\restriction k_{i+1} \in T^*$ and so we may take $i' \leq i$ and $\eta' \in T^{k_{i'}}$ such that $g(t) = \eta'(t)$.

Case 2: $n \leq i$.

Let $i' = i$ and $\eta' = \eta\restriction k_{i+1}$. We have $\eta' \in T^n \subseteq T^{k_i}$.

Claim 5 and the Lemma are established.

The proof of the following Theorem is very similar to the proof of Lemma 4.10.

Theorem 6.7. *Suppose* $\langle P_\eta : \eta \leq \kappa\rangle$ *is a countable support iteration based on* $\langle Q_\eta : \eta < \kappa\rangle$ *and suppose* $(\forall \eta < \kappa)(\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\eta}$ "for infinitely many $k \in \omega$ we have that Q_η is proper and $(f^{g^k}, g^{1/k})$-bounding"), *and suppose* $\gamma \in \omega$. *Suppose* λ *is a sufficiently large regular cardinal and* $\alpha < \kappa$ *and* x *and* z *are* P_α*-names and* T *is a* P_κ*-name and* $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\alpha}$ "x and z are positive rational numbers and $x < z$" and $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\kappa}$ "T is an (f^{g^γ}, g^x)-corseted tree." *Suppose* N *is a countable elementary submodel of* H_λ *and* $\{P_\kappa, \alpha, f, g, x, z, T\} \in N$. *Suppose* $p \in P_\alpha$ *and* p *is* N*-generic. Then* $p \Vdash$ "$(\forall q \in P_{\alpha,\kappa} \cap N[G_{P_\alpha}])(\exists q' \leq q)(\exists H)(H$ is an (f^{g^γ}, g^z)-corseted tree and $q' \Vdash$ '$T \subseteq H$')."

Proof: The proof proceeds by induction on κ. We assume that λ, N, α, p, x, z, and T are as in the hypothesis of the Theorem. Let $f' = f^{g^\gamma}$.

Fix q a P_α-name in N such that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash$ "$q \in P_{\alpha,\kappa}$."

Case 1. $\kappa = \beta + 1$.

Fix y a P_α-name in N such that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash$ "y is rational and $x < y < z$."

Using Lemma 6.4 choose $\tilde{q}$ and H' such that

$\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\beta}$ “$\tilde{q} \leq q(\beta)$ and H' is an (f', g^y)-corseted tree and $\tilde{q} \Vdash$ “$T \subseteq H'$.’ ”

We may assume that the names $\tilde{q}$ and H' are elements of N. Use the induction hypothesis to choose P_α-names q^* and H such that

$p \Vdash$ “$q^* \leq q \restriction \beta$ and H is an (f', g^x)-corseted tree and $q^* \Vdash$ ‘$H' \subseteq H$.’ ”

We have that $p \Vdash$ “$(q^*, \tilde{q}) \Vdash$ ‘$T \subseteq H$.’ ” Case 1 is established.

Case 2. $\mathrm{cf}(\kappa) > \omega$.

Because no ω-sequences of ordinals can be added at limit stages of uncountable cofinality, we may take β and T' and q' to be P_α-names in N such that

$\mathbf{1} \Vdash$ “$\alpha \leq \beta < \kappa$ and T' is a $P_{\alpha,\beta}$-name and $q' \leq q$ and
$\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_{\alpha,\beta}}$ ‘T' is an (f', g^x)-corseted tree’ and $q' \Vdash_{P_{\alpha,\kappa}}$ ‘$T' = T$.’ ”

For every $\beta_0 \in \kappa \cap N$ such that $\alpha \leq \beta_0$ let $\tilde{q}(\beta_0)$ and $H(\beta_0)$ be P_α-names in N such that

$\mathbf{1} \Vdash$ “if $\beta = \beta_0$ and there is some $\tilde{q} \leq q' \restriction \beta$ and some H^*
such that H^* is an (f', g^z)-corseted tree and $\tilde{q} \Vdash$ ‘$T' \subseteq H^*$,’
then $q^*(\beta_0)$ and $H(\beta_0)$ are witnesses thereto.”

Let q^* and H and s be P_α-names such that for every $\beta_0 \in \kappa \cap N$, if $\alpha \leq \beta_0$, then

$\mathbf{1} \Vdash$ “if $\beta = \beta_0$ then $q^* = q^*(\beta_0)$ and $H = H(\beta_0)$ and $s \in P_{\alpha,\kappa}$
and $s \restriction \beta = q^*$ and $s \restriction [\beta, \kappa) = q' \restriction [\beta, \kappa)$.”

Claim 1: $p \Vdash$ “$s \leq q$ and $s \in N[G_{P_\alpha}]$ and $s \Vdash$ ‘$T \subseteq H$.’ ”

Proof: Suppose $p' \leq p$. Take $p^* \leq p'$ and $\beta_0 < \kappa$ such that $p^* \Vdash$ “$\beta_0 = \beta$.” Because the name β is in N and p^* is N-generic, we have that $\beta_0 \in N$. Notice by the induction hypothesis we have

$p \Vdash$ “there is some $q^{\#} \leq q' \restriction \beta_0$ and some $(f'g^z)$-corseted tree $H^{\#}$
such that $q^{\#} \Vdash$ ‘$T' \subseteq H^{\#}$.’ ”

Hence

$p^* \Vdash$ “$q^* = q^*(\beta_0) \leq q' \restriction \beta$ and $H = H(\beta_0)$ and H is an (f', g^z)-corseted
tree and $q^* \Vdash$ ‘$T' \subseteq H$ and $q' \restriction [\beta, \kappa) \Vdash$ “$T' = T$.” ’ ”

Therefore $p^* \Vdash$ “$s \Vdash$ ‘$T \subseteq H$.’ ”

Claim 1 is established. This completes Case 2.

Case 3. $\mathrm{cf}(\kappa) = \omega$.

Let $\langle \alpha_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ be an increasing sequence from $\kappa \cap N$ cofinal in κ such that $\alpha_0 = \alpha$.

In $V[G_P]$, let X, $\langle h_m : m \in \omega - X \rangle$, ζ, $\langle \mathcal{T}_m : m \in \omega_X \rangle$, $\langle \mathcal{T}'_m : m \in \omega_X \rangle$, $\mathcal{T}$, and H' be as in the proof of Lemma 6.3 with $P_{\alpha,\kappa}$ playing the role of P. We may assume each of these P_α-names are in N.

Using Lemma 3.1, fix $\langle (p_n, \zeta_n) : n \in \omega \rangle \in N$ (that is, the sequence of names is an element of N but not necessarily their values) such that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash$ “$p_0 \leq q$” and for every $n \in \omega$ we have that each of the following holds:

(0) p_n is a P_α-name for an element of $P_{\alpha,\kappa}$, and

(1) For every $k \leq n$ we have $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_{\alpha_n}}$ “$p_0 \restriction [\alpha_n, \kappa) \Vdash$ ‘$(\forall t < k)(\zeta(t) = \zeta_n(t))$,’ ” and

(2) ζ_n is a P_{α_n}-name for an element of $[\mathcal{T}]$, and

(3) $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_{\alpha_n}}$ “$p_0 \restriction [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}) \Vdash$ ‘$(\forall t < k)(\zeta_n(t) = \zeta_{n+1}(t))$ for every $k \leq n+1$,’ ” and

(4) $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\alpha}$ “$p_{n+1} \leq p_n$,” and

(5) whenever $k \leq m < \omega$ we have

$$\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_{\alpha_n}} \text{“}p_m \restriction [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}) \Vdash \text{‘}(\forall t < k)(\zeta_n(t) = \zeta_{n+1}(t)).\text{’ ”}$$

Claim 2. Suppose $\alpha \leq \beta \leq \zeta < \kappa$ and $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\alpha}$ “$x' < z'$ are positive rational numbers” and suppose T' is a P_ζ-name for an $(f', g^{x'})$-corseted tree. Then

$$\begin{gathered}\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\beta} \text{“}V[G_{P_\alpha}] \models \text{‘}(\forall q \in P_{\beta,\zeta})(\exists q^* \leq q')(\exists H) \\ (H \text{ is an } (f', g^{z'})\text{-corseted tree and } q^* \Vdash \text{“}T' \subseteq H\text{”}).\text{’ ”}\end{gathered}$$

Proof: Given $r_1 \in P_\alpha$ and a P_α-name r_2 for an element of $P_{\alpha,\beta}$ and a P_β-name q for an element of $P_{\beta,\zeta} \cap V[G_{P_\alpha}]$, choose λ' a sufficiently large regular cardinal and N' a countable elementary substructure of $H_{\lambda'}$ containing $\{r_1, r_2, q, P_\kappa, \alpha, \beta, \zeta, x', z', T'\}$. Choose $r'_1 \leq r_1$ such that r'_1 is N'-generic. By the overall induction hypothesis (i.e., because $\zeta < \kappa$) we have

$$r'_1 \Vdash \text{“}(\exists s \leq (r_2, q))(\exists H)(H \text{ is an } (f', g^{z'})\text{-corseted tree and } s \Vdash \text{‘}T' \subseteq H\text{’}).\text{”}$$

Consequently, we may choose s and h such that

$$\begin{gathered}(r'_1, s\restriction\beta) \Vdash \text{“}V[G_{P_\alpha}] \models \text{‘}s\restriction[\beta,\zeta) \leq q \text{ and} \\ H \text{ is an } (f', g^{z'})\text{-corseted tree and } s\restriction[\beta,\zeta) \Vdash \text{‘}T' \subseteq H\text{’}).\text{”}\end{gathered}$$

The Claim is established.

In $V[G_{P_\alpha}]$ fix a positive rational number $y < 1/(\gamma + k)$ where k is as in the proof of Lemma 6.3. We may assume that the name y is in N.

Let $\Omega = \{x' \in N : x'$ is a P_α-name and $\mathbf{1} \Vdash$ "x' is rational and $0 < x' < y$"$\}$. Let $\langle y_n : n \in \omega\rangle$ enumerate Ω. Build $\langle x^*_n : n \in \omega\rangle$ as follows. Let $x^*_0 = y_0$, and for each $n \in \omega$ choose $x^*_{n+1} \in \Omega$ such that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash$ "$x^*_n < x^*_{n+1}$ and $y_{n+1} < x^*_{n+1}$." Also build $\langle x_n : n \in \omega\rangle$ a sequence of elements of Ω such that for each $n \in \omega$ we have $x^*_n < x_n < x^*_{n+1}$.

For each $n \in \omega$ let $\langle T_{n,j} : j \in \omega\rangle$ list all P_α-names $T' \in N$ such that in $V[G_{P_\alpha}]$ we have for some $y' < x^*_{n+1}$ we have that $T' \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ is an $(f', g^{y'})$-corseted tree, and build $\langle x_{n,j} : j \in \omega\rangle$ a sequence of elements of Ω such that in $V[G_{P_\alpha}]$ for every $j \in \omega$ we have that $x_n < x_{n,j} < x_{n,j+1} < x^*_{n+1}$ and $T_{n,j} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ is an $(f', g^{x_{n,j}})$-corseted tree.

Using Lemma 6.6, choose $T^* \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ an (f', g^y)-corseted tree and $\langle T^n : n \in \omega\rangle \in V[G_{P_\alpha}]$ a sequence such that $T^* \in V[G_{P_\alpha}]$ and $T^0 \subseteq T^*$ and $\zeta \in [T^0]$ and for every $n \in \omega$ we have $T^n \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ is an (f', g^{x_n})-corseted tree and $T^n \subseteq T^{n+1}$ and, in $V[G_{P_\kappa}]$, we have that for every $j \in \omega$ and every $g \in [T_{n,j}]$ there is $k \in \omega$ such that for every $\eta \in T_{n,j}$ extending $g \restriction k$, if $\eta \restriction k \in T^n \cap T^*$ then $\eta \in T^{n+1} \cap T^*$.

Note that the reason we worked in $V[G_{P_\kappa}]$ in the preceding paragraph is because we wish to allow g to range over $[T_{n,j}]$ with the brackets interpreted in $V[G_{P_\kappa}]$.

We may assume that the names T^* and $\langle T^n : n \in \omega\rangle$ are in N.

For each $n \in \omega$ let $F_{n,0}$ and $F_{n,2}$ and y^*_n be P_{α_n}-names such that

$$\begin{gathered}\mathbf{1} \Vdash \text{“}F_{n,0} \text{ and } F_{n,2} \text{ and } y^*_n \text{ are functions, all three of which are in } V[G_{P_\alpha}] \\ \text{each of whose domain is equal to } P_{\alpha_n,\alpha_{n+1}}, \text{ such that} \\ (\forall q' \in P_{\alpha_n,\alpha_{n+1}} \cap V[G_{P_\alpha}])(F_{n,0}(q') \subseteq \mathcal{T} \text{ and} \\ F_{n,0}(q') \in V[G_{P_\alpha}] \text{ is an } (f', g^{y^*_n(q')})\text{-corseted tree} \\ \text{and } y^*_n(q') \text{ is rational and } 0 < y^*_n(q') < x^*_{n+1} \text{ and } F_{n,2}(q') \leq q' \\ \text{and } F_{n,2}(q') \Vdash \text{‘}\zeta_{n+1} \in [F_{n,0}(q')]\text{’.”}\end{gathered}$$

We may assume that the names $F_{n,0}$ and $F_{n,2}$ and y^*_n are in N.

For each $n \in \omega$ we may, in $V[G_{P_{\alpha_n}}]$, use Lemma 6.6 to choose a positive rational number $y_n < x_{n+1}$ and $\tilde{T}_n \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ an (f', g^{y_n})-corseted tree and $\langle k^n_i : i \in \omega\rangle \in V[G_{P_\alpha}]$ an increasing sequence of integers such that $\tilde{T}_n \in V[G_{P_\alpha}]$ and $T^n \subseteq \tilde{T}_n$ and for every $\eta \in T^n$ and every $i \in \omega$ and every $\nu \in F_{n,0}(p_{k^n_i} \restriction [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}))$, if

$\text{length}(\eta) \geq k_i^n$ and ν extends η, then $\nu \in \tilde{T}_n$.

We may assume that for each $n \in \omega$ the P_{α_n}-names $\tilde{T}_n$ and $\langle k_i^n\, i \in \omega\rangle$ are in N.

Claim 3. We may be build $\langle r_n : n \in \omega\rangle$ such that $r_0 = p$ and for every $n \in \omega$ we have that the following hold:

(1) $r_n \in P_{\alpha_n}$ is N-generic, and

(2) $r_{n+1}\restriction\alpha_n = r_n$, and

(3) $r_n \Vdash$ "$\zeta_n \in [T^n] \cap [T^*]$," and

(4) $p \Vdash$ "$r_n\restriction[\alpha, \alpha_n) \leq p_0\restriction\alpha_n$."

The proof of this Claim is the same as the proof of Claim 3 of the proof of Lemma 4.10. The Claim is established.

Let q' be a P_α-name such that

$$p \Vdash \text{“}q' = \bigcup\{r_n\restriction[\alpha, \alpha_n) : n \in \omega\}.\text{”}$$

Define H^* by $H(m) = \bigcup\{h_m^{-1}(t) : t \in \{\eta(m) : \eta \in T^* \text{ and } m \in \text{dom}(\eta)\} \cap \text{range}(h_m)\}$ for $m \in \omega - X$, and $H^*(m) = \omega$ for $m \in X$.

Let $H = \{\eta \in {}^{<\omega}\omega : (\forall i \in \text{dom}(\eta))(\eta(i) \in H^*(i))\}$.

As in Lemma 6.3, we have that H is an (f^{g^γ}, g^z)-corseted tree and $\mathbf{1} \Vdash$ "$T \subseteq H$." By Claim 3, we have that q' and H satisfy the requirements of the Theorem.

The Theorem is established.

Corollary 6.8. *Suppose* $\langle P_\eta : \eta \leq \kappa\rangle$ *is a countable support iteration based on* $\langle Q_\eta : \eta < \kappa\rangle$ *and suppose that for every* $\eta < \kappa$ *we have that* $\mathbf{1} \Vdash$ "for infinitely many $k \in \omega$ we have that Q_η is proper and $(f^{g^k}, g^{1/k})$-bounding." *Then* P_κ *is* $(f^{g^k}, g^{1/k})$*-bounding for every positive* $k \in \omega$.

Proof: By Theorem 6.7 with $\alpha = 0$.

7 P-point property

In this section we define the P-point property and prove that it is preserved by countable support iteration of proper forcings. This is due to Shelah [12, Conclusion VI.2.12G].

Definition 7.1. *Suppose* $n \in \omega$ *and* $x \in {}^\omega(\omega - \{0\})$ *is strictly increasing. We say that* (j, k, m) *is an* x*-bound system above* n *iff each of the following holds:*

(1) j and m are functions from $k + 1$ into ω, and

(2) $j(0) > x(n + m(0) + 1)$, and
(3) $(\forall l < k)(j(l + 1) > x(j(l) + m(l + 1) + 1))$.

Definition 7.2. *Suppose $n \in \omega$ and $x \in {}^{\omega}(\omega - \{0\})$ is strictly increasing and (j, k, m) is an x-bound system above n and T is a tree. We say that T is a (j, k, m, η)-squeezed tree iff each of the following holds:*

(1) $\mathrm{dom}(\eta) = \{(l, t) \in \omega^2 : l \leq k \text{ and } t \leq m(l)\}$, and
(2) $(\forall (l, t) \in \mathrm{dom}(\eta))(\eta(l, t) \in {}^{j(l)}\omega)$, and
(3) $(\forall \nu \in T)(\exists (l, t) \in \mathrm{dom}(\eta))(\nu \text{ is comparable with } \eta(l, t))$.

It is easy to see that the following Definition is equivalent to [12, Definition VI.2.12A].

Definition 7.3. *We say that T is x-squeezed iff for every $n \in \omega$ there is some x-bound system (j, m, k) above n such that T is (j, k, m, η)-squeezed for some η.*

In other words, T is x-squeezed when, living above any given level of T, say $\{\xi \in T : \mathrm{lh}(\xi) = n + 1\}$, there is a maximal antichain $\mathcal{A}$ of T that can be decomposed as $\mathcal{A} = \bigcup\{\mathcal{A}_l : l \leq k\}$ where each $\mathcal{A}_l$ is a subset of $\{\xi \in T : \mathrm{lh}(\xi) = j(l)\}$ of cardinality at most $m(l) + 1$, such that the levels of $\mathcal{A}$ are stratified so sparsely that conditions (2) and (3) of Definition 7.1 hold. Notice that for any given $l \leq k$ we may have that $\{\eta(l, t) : t \leq m(l)\}$ is a proper superset of $\mathcal{A}_l$; indeed, it need not even be a subset of T. We could modify Definition 7.2 to require this, but there is no need to do so.

Lemma 7.4. *Suppose $1 \ll x \ll y$ and both x and y are strictly increasing and T is a y-squeezed tree. Then T is an x-squeezed tree.*

Proof: Every y-bound system is an x-bound system.

Definition 7.5. *We say that P has the P-point property iff for every $x \in {}^{\omega}(\omega - \{0\})$ strictly increasing, we have*

$$\mathbf{1} \Vdash \text{“}(\forall f \in {}^{\omega}\omega)(\exists H \in V)(f \in [H] \text{ and } H \text{ is an } x\text{-squeezed tree}).\text{”}$$

Lemma 7.6. *P has the P-point property iff for every $x \in {}^{\omega}(\omega - \{0\})$ strictly increasing and every $p \in P$, if $p \Vdash_P$ “$f \in {}^{\omega}\omega$” there are $q \leq p$ and an x-squeezed tree H such that $q \Vdash$ “$f \in [H]$.”*

Proof: Assume that P has the P-point property. Given x, p, and f, there is $q \leq p$ and $H \subseteq {}^{<\omega}\omega$ such that $q \Vdash$ “$f \in [H]$ and H is an x-squeezed tree.” By the Shoenfield Absoluteness Theorem we have that H is an x-squeezed tree.

The other direction is immediate, and so the Lemma is established.

Lemma 7.7. *Suppose T is an x-squeezed tree and $n \in \omega$. Then $T \cap {}^{n}\omega$ is finite.*

Proof. Fix (j, k, m) an x-bound system above n and fix η such that T is a (j, k, m, η)-squeezed tree. We have $T \cap {}^{n}\omega \subseteq \{\eta(s,t)\restriction n : t \leq j(k) \text{ and } s \leq m(t)\}$.

Lemma 7.8. *Suppose that P has the P-point property. Then P is ${}^{\omega}\omega$-bounding.*

Proof: Suppose $p \in P$ and $p \Vdash$ "$f \in {}^{\omega}\omega$." Pick $x \in {}^{\omega}(\omega - \{0\})$ such that $1 \ll x$, and take $q \leq p$ and H an x-squeezed tree such that $q \Vdash$ "$f \in [H]$." By Lemma 7.7 we may define $h \in {}^{\omega}\omega$ by $(\forall n \in \omega)(h(n) = \max\{\nu(n) : \nu \in H$ and $n \in \mathrm{dom}(\nu)\})$. Clearly $q \Vdash$ "$f \leq h$," and the Lemma is established.

Lemma 7.9. *Suppose P has the Sacks property. Then P has the P-point property.*

Proof. Suppose $x \in {}^{\omega}(\omega - \{0\})$ is strictly increasing and $p \in P$ and $p \Vdash$ "$f \in {}^{\omega}\omega$." Choose $y \in {}^{\omega}(\omega - \{0\})$ monotonically non-decreasing such that for $n > x(3)$ we have that $y(n)$ is the greatest $t \in \omega$ such that $x(3t) < n$. Using the Sacks property, choose $q \leq p$ and H a y-sized tree such that $q \Vdash$ "$f \in [H]$."

Notice that for all $t > 0$ we have $y(x(3t))$ is less than or equal to the greatest integer k satisfying $x(3k) < x(3t)$, and therefore we have

$(*)$ $(\forall t \in \omega)(y(x(3t)) < t)$.

Suppose $n > x(3)$. Let j be such that $\mathrm{dom}(j) = \{0\}$ and $j(0) = x(2n) + 1$; let $k = 0$; and let m be such that $\mathrm{dom}(m) = \{0\}$ and $m(0) = |H \cap {}^{j(0)}\omega|$.

Claim: (j, k, m) is an x-bound system above n.

Proof: We have $x(n + m(0) + 1) \leq x(n + 1 + y(x(2n) + 1)) \leq x(n + 1 + y(x(3n))) \leq x(n + 1 + n - 1) < x(2n) + 1 = j(0)$. The first inequality is because $m(0) = |H \cap {}^{j(0)}\omega| \leq y(j(0)) = y(x(2n) + 1)$. The second inequality is because x is stricltly increasing and y is monotonically non-decreasing. The third inequality is by $(*)$.

The Claim is established.

Define η with domain equal to $\{(0.i) : i < m(0)\}$ and such that $\langle \eta(0, i) : i < m(0)\rangle$ enumerates $H \cap {}^{j(0)}\omega$. Clearly H is a (j, k, m, η)-squeezed tree, so the Lemma is established.

Lemma 7.10. *Suppose $y \in {}^{\omega}(\omega - \{0\})$ is strictly increasing and T and T' are y-squeezed trees. Then $T \cup T'$ is a y-squeezed tree.*

Proof: Given $n \in \omega$, choose (j, k, m, η) such that (j, k, m) is a y-bound systems above n and T is (j, k, m, η)-squeezed. Let $h = j(k)$. Choose (j', m', k') a y-bound system above h and choose η' such that T' is (j', k', m', η')-squeezed. We proceed to fuse (j, k, m, η) with $(j', k'm', \eta')$. For every $l \leq k$ let $j^*(l) = j(l)$ and for every l such that $k < l \leq k+k'+1$ let $j^*(l) = j'(l-k_n-1)$. Let $k^* = k+k'+1$. For every $l \leq k$ let $m^*(l) = m(l)$ and for every l such that $k < l \leq k + k' + 1$ let $m^*(l) = m'(l - k - 1)$. For every $l \leq k$ and $\beta \leq m(l)$ let $\eta^*(l, \beta) = \eta(l, \beta)$ and for every l such that $k < l \leq k + k' + 1$ and every $\beta \leq m'(l - k - 1)$ let $\eta^*(l, \beta) = \eta'(l - k - 1, \beta)$. It is straightforward to verify that (j^*, k^*, m^*) is a y-bound system above n and that $T \cup T'$ is (j^*, k^*, m^*, η^*)-squeezed.

The Lemma is established.

Definition 7.11. *Suppose $n \in \omega$ and $h \in {}^{\omega}\omega$ and $y \in {}^{\omega}(\omega - \{0\})$ is strictly increasing. Suppose (j, m, k) is a y-bound system above n. We say that (j, m, k) is h-tight iff $j(k) < h(n)$. For T a y-squeezed tree, we say that T is h-tight iff for every $n \in \omega$ there is an h-tight y-bound system (j, m, k) above n such that for some η we have that T is (j, m, k, η)-squeezed for some η.*

Lemma 7.12. *Suppose P has the P-point property and $y \in {}^{\omega}(\omega - \{0\})$ is strictly increasing and $\mathbf{1} \Vdash$* "T is a y-squeezed tree." *Then $\mathbf{1} \Vdash$* "$(\exists H \in V)(H$ is a y-squeezed tree and $T \subseteq H)$."

Proof. Suppose $p \in P$ and $p \Vdash$ "T is a y-squeezed tree." Fix $q' \leq p$. By Lemma 7.8 we may choose $h \in {}^{\omega}\omega$ and $q \leq q'$ such that $q \Vdash$ "T is h-tight."

Define $z \in {}^{\omega}(\omega - \{0\})$ by $z(0) = 0$ and

$$(\forall n \in \omega)(z(n+1) = h(z(n))).$$

For every $n \in \omega$ let $\mathcal{T}_n = \{t \subseteq {}^{<h(n)}\omega : t = T \cap {}^{<h(n)}\omega$ for some h-tight y-squeezed tree $T\}$.

Let $\mathcal{T} = \bigcup\{\mathcal{T}_n : n \in \omega\}$. We implicitly fix an isomorphism from ${}^{<\omega}\omega$ onto $\mathcal{T}$.

Using the fact that P satisfies the P-point property, fix $q^* \leq q$ and $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ such that $\mathcal{C}$ is a z-squeezed tree and $q^* \Vdash$ "$(\forall n \in \omega)(T \cap {}^{<h(n)}\omega \in \mathcal{C})$."

Define $H^* = \bigcup \mathcal{C}$ and let $H = \{\nu \in H^* : (\forall n \in \omega)(\exists \eta \in {}^{n}\omega \cap H^*)(\eta$ is comparable with $\nu)\}$.

Pick a z-bound system (j^*, k^*, m^*) above n and η^* such that $\mathcal{C}$ is a (j^*, k^*, m^*, η^*)-squeezed tree.

Fix $n \in \omega$. We show that there is a y-bound system (j, m, k) above n such that for some η we have that H is (j, m, k, η)-squeezed.

Claim 1. For every $\beta \leq m^*(0)$ we have $\mathrm{ht}(\eta^*(0, \beta)) \geq h(z(n + \beta + 1))$. For every non-zero $\alpha \leq k^*$ and every $\beta \leq m^*(\alpha)$ we have $\mathrm{ht}(\eta^*(\alpha, \beta)) \geq h(z(j^*(\alpha - 1) + \beta + 1))$.

Proof: For every $\beta \leq m^*(0)$ we have $\mathrm{ht}(\eta^*(0, \beta)) = h(\mathrm{rk}_{\mathcal{T}}(\eta^*(0, \beta))) = h(j^*(0)) \geq h(z(n + m^*(0) + 1)) \geq h(z(n + \beta + 1))$. For every non-zero $\alpha \leq k^*$ and every $\beta \leq m^*(\alpha)$ we have $\mathrm{ht}(\eta^*(\alpha, \beta)) = h(\mathrm{rk}_{\mathcal{T}}(\eta^*(\alpha, \beta))) = h(j^*(\alpha)) \geq h(z(j^*(\alpha - 1) + m^*(\alpha) + 1)) \geq h(z(j^*(\alpha - 1) + \beta + 1))$.

By Claim 1 we may construct y-bound systems as follows. For every $\beta \leq m^*(0)$, fix an h-tight y-bound system $(j^{0,\beta}, m^{0,\beta}, k^{0,\beta})$ above $z(n + \beta + 1)$ along with $\eta^{0.\beta}$ such that for some $(j^{0,\beta}, m^{0,\beta}, k^{0,\beta}, \eta^{0,\beta})$-squeezed tree T we have $\eta^*(0, \beta) = {}^{<h(z(n+\beta+1))}\omega \cap T$, and for every non-zero $\alpha \leq k^*$ and $\beta \leq m^*(\alpha)$, fix an h-tight y-bound system $(j^{\alpha,\beta}, m^{\alpha,\beta}, k^{\alpha,\beta})$ above $z(j^*(\alpha - 1) + \beta + 1)$ along with $\eta^{\alpha.\beta}$ such that for some $(j^{\alpha,\beta}, m^{\alpha,\beta}, k^{\alpha,\beta}, \eta^{\alpha,\beta})$-squeezed tree T we have $\eta^*(\alpha, \beta) = {}^{<h(z(j^*(\alpha-1)+\beta+1))}\omega \cap T$.

We define

$$\hat{\jmath}(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) = j^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\gamma)$$

and

$$\hat{k}(\alpha, \beta) = k^{(\alpha,\beta)}$$

and

$$\hat{m}(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) = m^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\gamma)$$

and for $t \leq \hat{m}(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ let

$$\hat{\eta}(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, t) = \eta^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\gamma, t).$$

Claim 2. Suppose $n \in \omega$. Then we have the following:

(1) $\hat{\jmath}(0, 0, 0) > y(n + \hat{m}(0, 0, 0) + 1)$, and

(2) For every $\alpha \leq k^*$ and $\beta \leq m^*(\alpha)$ and $\gamma < \hat{k}(\alpha, \beta)$ we have $\hat{\jmath}(\alpha, \beta, \gamma + 1) > y(\hat{\jmath}(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) + \hat{m}(\alpha, \beta, \gamma + 1) + 1)$, and

(3) For every $\alpha \leq k^*$ and every $\beta < m^*(\alpha)$ we have $\hat{\jmath}(\alpha, \beta + 1, 0) > y(\hat{\jmath}(\alpha, \beta, \hat{k}(\alpha, \beta)) + \hat{m}(\alpha, \beta + 1, 0) + 1)$, and

(4) For every $\alpha < k^*$ we have $\hat{\jmath}(\alpha+1,0,0) > y(\hat{\jmath}(\alpha, m^*(\alpha), \hat{k}(\alpha, m^*(\alpha))) + \hat{m}(\alpha+1,0,0)+1)$.

Proof: Clause (1) holds because $j^{(0,0)}(0) > y(n + m^{(0,0)}(0)+1)$.

Clause (2) holds because $j^{(,\alpha,\beta)}(\gamma+1) > y(j^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\gamma) + m^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\gamma+1)+1)$.

We verify clause (3) as follows.

Case A: $\alpha = 0$.

Notice that $j^{0,\beta)}(k^{(0,\beta)}) < h(z(n+\beta+1))$ becuase the system $(j^{(0,\beta)}, m^{(0,\beta)}, k^{(0,\beta)})$ is h-tight above $z(n+\beta+1)$. Notice also that $j^{(0,\beta+1)}(0) > y(z(n+\beta+2) + m^{(0,\beta+1)}(0)+1)$ because the system $(j^{(0,\beta+1)}, m^{(0,\beta+1)}, k^{(0,\beta+1)})$ is above $z(n+\beta+2)$. Hence we have $\hat{\jmath}(0,\beta+1,0) = j^{(0,\beta+1)}(0) > y(z(n+\beta+2) + m^{(0,\beta+1)}(0)+1) \geq y(h(z(n+\beta+1)) + m^{(0,\beta+1)}(0)+1) \geq y(j^{(0,\beta)}(k^{(0,\beta)}) + m^{(0,\beta+1)}(0)+1) = y(\hat{\jmath}(0,\beta,\hat{k}(0,\beta)) + \hat{m}(0,\beta+1,0)+1)$.

Case B: $\alpha > 0$.

Notice that $j^{\alpha,\beta)}(k^{(\alpha,\beta)}) < h(z(j^*(\alpha-1)+\beta+1))$ becuase the system $(j^{(\alpha,\beta)}, m^{(\alpha,\beta)}, k^{(\alpha,\beta)})$ is h-tight above $z(j^*(\alpha-1)+\beta+1)$. Notice also that $j^{(\alpha,\beta+1)}(0) > y(z(j^*(\alpha-1)+\beta+2) + m^{(\alpha,\beta+1)}(0)+1)$ because the system $(j^{(\alpha,\beta+1)}, m^{(\alpha,\beta+1)}, k^{(\alpha,\beta+1)})$ is above $z(j^*(\alpha-1)+\beta+2)$. Hence we have $\hat{\jmath}(\alpha,\beta+1,0) = j^{(\alpha,\beta+1)}(0) > y(z(j^*(\alpha-1)+\beta+2)+m^{(\alpha,\beta+1)}(0)+1) \geq y(h(z(j^*(\alpha-1)+\beta+1))+m^{(\alpha,\beta+1)}(0)+1) \geq y(j^{(\alpha,\beta)}(k^{(\alpha,\beta)}) + m^{(\alpha,\beta+1)}(0)+1) = y(\hat{\jmath}(\alpha,\beta,\hat{k}(\alpha,\beta)) + \hat{m}(\alpha,\beta+1,0)+1)$.

To see that clause (4) holds, we have $\hat{\jmath}(\alpha+1,0,0) = j^{(\alpha+1,0)}(0) \geq y(z(j^*(\alpha)+1)+m^{(\alpha+1,0)}(0)+1) \geq y(h(z(j^*(\alpha)))+m^{(\alpha+1,0)}(0)+1) \geq y(h(j^*(\alpha))+m^{(\alpha+1,0)}(0)+1) \geq y(h(z(j^*(\alpha-1))+m^*(\alpha)+1))+m^{(\alpha+1,0)}(0)+1) \geq y(j^{(\alpha,m^*(\alpha))}(k^{(\alpha,m^*(\alpha))})+m^{(\alpha+1,0)}(0)+1)$.

The first inequality is because the system $(j^{(\alpha+1,0)}, m^{(\alpha+1,0)}, k^{(\alpha+1,0)})$ is above $z(j^*(\alpha)+1)$ whence by clause (2) of Definition 7.1 we have the first inequality. The second inequality is by definition of the function z. The third inequality is by the fact that z is an increasing function. The fourth inequality is because (j^*, m^*, k^*) satisfies clause (2) of Definition 7.1. The fifth inequallity is because the system $(j^{(\alpha,m^*(\alpha))}, m^{(\alpha,m^*(\alpha))}, k^{(\alpha,m^*(\alpha))})$ is h-tight above $z(j^*(\alpha-1)+m^*(\alpha)+1)$.

The Claim is established.

Claim 3. Suppose $n \in \omega$ and $\nu \in H$. Then there are $\alpha \leq k^*$ and $\beta \leq m^*(\alpha)$ and $\gamma \leq \hat{k}(\alpha,\beta)$ and $\delta \leq \hat{m}(\alpha,\beta,\gamma)$ such that ν is comparable with $\hat{\eta}(\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta)$.

Proof. Pick $t \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $\nu \in t$. Take α and β such that t is comparable with $\eta^*(\alpha,\beta)$.

Case 1: $\nu \in \eta^*(\alpha,\beta)$.

Take $\gamma \leq k^{(\alpha,\beta)}$ and $\delta \leq m^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\gamma)$ such that ν is comparable with $\eta^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\gamma,\delta)$.

Case 2: $\nu \notin \eta^*(\alpha,\beta)$.

If $\alpha = 0$ then let $\zeta = z(n+\beta+1)$ and if $\alpha > 0$ then let $\zeta = z(j^*(\alpha-1)+\beta+1)$. Let $\nu' = \nu\restriction h(\zeta)$. Choose $\gamma \leq k^{(\alpha,\beta)}$ and $\delta \leq m^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\gamma)$ such that ν' is comparable with $\eta^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\gamma,\delta)$. Becuase the system $(j^{\alpha,\beta}), m^{\alpha,\beta}, k^{(\alpha,\beta)}$ is h-tight above ζ we have $\eta^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\gamma,\delta) \leq \nu'$. Therefore $\eta^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\gamma,\delta) \leq \nu$.

The Claim is established.

For each $n \in \omega$ define $\zeta(\alpha,\beta,\gamma)$ by the following recursive formulas:

$$\zeta(0,0,0) = 0.$$

For $\alpha \leq k^*$ and $\beta \leq m^*(\alpha)$ and $\gamma < \hat{k}(\alpha,\beta)$ we have

$$\zeta(\alpha,\beta,\gamma+1) = \zeta(\alpha,\beta,\gamma)+1.$$

For $\alpha \leq k^*$ and $\beta < m^*(\alpha)$ we have

$$\zeta(\alpha,\beta+1,0) = \zeta(\alpha,\beta,\hat{k}(\alpha,\beta))+1.$$

For $\alpha < k^*$ we have

$$\zeta(\alpha+1,0,0) = \zeta(\alpha,m^*(\alpha),\hat{k}(\alpha,m^*(\alpha)))+1.$$

Define $\tilde{\jmath}(\zeta(\alpha,\beta,\gamma)) = \hat{\jmath}(\alpha,\beta,\gamma)$, and $\tilde{m}(\zeta(\alpha,\beta,\gamma)) = \hat{m}(\alpha,\beta,\gamma)$, and $\tilde{k}(\zeta(\alpha,\beta)) = \hat{k}(\alpha,\beta)$, and $\tilde{\eta}(\zeta(\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta)) = \hat{\eta}(\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta)$, and

Claim 4. $(\tilde{\jmath},\tilde{k},\tilde{m})$ is a y-bound system above n and H is a $(\tilde{\jmath},\tilde{k},\tilde{m},\tilde{\eta})$-squeezed tree.

Proof. By Claims 2 and 3.

The Lemma is established.

Lemma 7.13. *Suppose* $x \in {}^{\omega}(\omega - \{0\})$ *is strictly increasing and suppose that for each* $n \in \omega$ *we have that* T_n *is an* x*-squeezed tree. Then there are* T^* *and* $\langle \gamma_t : t \in \omega\rangle$ *an increasing sequence of integers such that* T^* *is an* x*-squeezed tree and* $\gamma_0 = 0$ *and* $(\forall t > 0)(t < \gamma_t)$ *and for every* $f \in {}^{<\omega}\omega$ *we have*

$$(\forall t > 0)(\exists s < t)(f\restriction\gamma_t \in T_{\gamma_s}) \text{ iff } f \in T^*.$$

Proof: For each $n \in \omega$ choose $h_n \in {}^{\omega}\omega$ such that T_n is h_n-tight.

We build as follows. Let $\gamma_0 = 0$. Given γ_t, define $g_t(0) = \gamma_t$. For $0 \leq s \leq t$ let $g_t(s+1) = h_{\gamma_s}(g_t(s))$. Let $\gamma_{t+1} = g_t(t+1)$.

Let $T^* = \{\eta \in {}^{<\omega}\omega : (\forall t > 0)(\exists s < t)(\eta \restriction \gamma_t \in T_{\gamma_s})\}$.

Now fix $n \in \omega$. We build an x-bound system (j, m, k) above n and we build η so that (j, m, k) and η witness the fact that T^* is x-squeezed.

For every $t \in \omega$ and $s \leq t$ choose an h_{γ_s}-tight x-bound system (j^s_t, m^s_t, k^s_t) above $g_t(s)$ along with η^s_t such that T_{γ_s} is $(j^s_t, m^s_t, k^s_t, \eta^s_t)$-squeezed.

We define ζ such that for $\alpha \geq n$ and $\beta \leq \alpha$ and $\gamma \leq k^\alpha_\beta$ we have

- $\zeta(n, 0, 0) = 0$, and
- if $\gamma < k^\alpha_\beta$ then $\zeta(\alpha, \beta, \gamma + 1) = \zeta(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) + 1$, and
- if $\beta < \alpha$ then $\zeta(\alpha, \beta + 1, 0) = \zeta(\alpha, \beta, k^\alpha_\beta) + 1$, and
- if $\alpha \geq n$ then $\zeta(\alpha + 1, 0, 0) = \zeta(\alpha, \alpha, k^\alpha_\alpha) + 1$.

We define (j, m, k) such that for every $\alpha \geq n$ and $\beta \leq \alpha$ and $\gamma \leq k^\alpha_\beta$ we have

- $j(\zeta(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)) = j^\alpha_\beta(\gamma)$, and
- $m(\zeta(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)) = m^\alpha_\beta(\gamma)$, and
- $k = k^\alpha_\beta$.

Claim 1. (j, m, k) is an x-bound system above n.

Proof: Clause (1) of Definition 7.1 is immediate.

Clause (2) of Definition 7.1 holds because $j(0) = j^0_n(0) > x(g^0_n(0)+m^0_n(0)+1) \geq x(n + m(0) + 1)$. The first inequality holds because the system (j^0_n, m^0_n, k^0_n) is above $g^0_n(0)$ and it satisfies clause (2) of Definition 7.1.

We have $j(\zeta(\alpha, \beta, \gamma+1)) = j^\beta_\alpha(\gamma+1) > x(j^\beta_\alpha(\gamma)+m^\beta_\alpha(\gamma+1)+1) = x(j(\zeta(\alpha, \beta, \gamma))+ m(\zeta(\alpha, \beta, \gamma + 1)) + 1)$.

We have $j(\zeta(\alpha, \beta+1, 0)) = j^{\beta+1}_\alpha(0) > x(g_\alpha(\beta+1)+m^{\beta+1}_\alpha(0)+1) \geq x(h_{\gamma_\beta}(g_\alpha(\beta))+ m^{\beta+1}_\alpha(0)+1) \geq x(j^\beta_\alpha(k^\beta_\alpha)+m^{\beta+1}_\alpha(0)+1) = x(j(\zeta(\alpha, \beta, k^\beta_\alpha))+m(\zeta(\alpha, \beta+1, 0))+1)$.

The first inequality is clause (2) of Definition 7.1 applied to the system $(j^{\beta+1}_\alpha, m^{\beta+1}_\alpha, k^{\beta+1}_\alpha)$. The second inequality is by the definition of g_α. The third inequality is because the system $(j^\beta_\alpha, m^\beta_\alpha, k^\beta_\alpha)$ is h_{γ_β}-tight above $g_\alpha(\beta)$.

The Claim is established.

We define η such that for every $\alpha \geq n$ and $\beta \leq \alpha$ and $\gamma \leq k^\alpha_\beta$ and $\delta \leq m^\beta_\alpha(\gamma)$ we have $\eta(\zeta(\alpha, \beta, \gamma), \delta) = \eta^\beta_\alpha(\gamma, \delta)$.

Claim 3: T^* is a (j, k, m, η)-squeezed tree.

Proof: It is straightforward to verify that T^* is a tree and that clause (1) and clause (2) of Definition 7.2 hold.

To verify clause (3), suppose we have $\nu \in T^*$. We show that ν is comparable to some $\eta(l,i)$ with $(l,i) \in \mathrm{dom}(\eta)$. Choose $\nu' \in T^*$ such that $\nu \leq \nu'$ and $\mathrm{lh}(\nu') \geq \gamma_{n+1}$. It suffices to show that ν' is comparable with some $\eta(l,i)$ with $(l,i) \in \mathrm{dom}(\eta)$. Because $\nu' \in T^*$ we may choose $s \leq n$ such that $\nu' \restriction \gamma_{n+1} \in T_{\gamma_s}$. We may select $(l,i) \in \mathrm{dom}(\eta^s_n)$ such that $\nu' \restriction \gamma_{n+1}$ is comparable with $\eta^s_n(l,i)$. We have $\eta^n_s(l,i) = \eta(\zeta(n,s,l),i)$, so $\mathrm{lh}(\eta^s_n(l,i)) = j(\zeta(n,s,l)) = j^s_n(l) \leq h_{\gamma_s}(g_n(s)) = g_n(s+1) \leq \gamma_{n+1}$. Therefore $\eta(\zeta(n,s,l),i) \leq \nu' \restriction \gamma_{n+1}$ and therefore $\eta(\zeta(n,s,l),i)$ is comparable with ν'.

The Claim and the Lemma are established.

Lemma 7.14. *Suppose* $x \in {}^{\omega}(\omega - \{0\})$ *is strictly increasing, and suppose* P *is a forcing notion such that* $V[G_P] \models$ "for all countable $X \subseteq V$ there is a countable $Y \in V$ such that $X \subseteq Y$ and $\langle T_n : n \in \omega\rangle$ is a sequence of x-squeezed trees and $(\forall n \in \omega)(T_n \in V)$." *Then* $V[G_P] \models$ "there is a strictly increasing sequence of integers $\langle m_i : i \in \omega\rangle$ and an x-squeezed tree $T^* \in V$ such that $m_0 = 0$ and $(\forall i > 0)(m_i > i)$ and for every $\eta \in {}^{<\omega}\omega$, if $(\forall i > 0)(\exists j < i)(\eta \restriction m_{i+1} \in T_{m_j})$ then $\eta \in T^*$."

Proof: Work in $V[G_P]$. Let $b \in V$ be a countable set such that $\{T_n : n \in \omega\} \subseteq b \in V$ and $(\forall x \in b)(x$ is an x-squeezed tree). Let $\langle S_n : n \in \omega\rangle \in V$ enumerate b with infinitely many repetitions such that $S_0 = T_0$. Build $\langle S'_n : n \in \omega\rangle$ by setting $S'_0 = S_0$ and for every $n > 0$ set $S'_n = S_n \cup S'_{n-1}$. Build h mapping ω into ω inductively by setting $h(0) = 0$ and for every $n > 0$ set $h(n)$ equal to the least integer m such that $m > h(n-1)$ and $T_n = S_m$.

Using Lemma 7.13, take $T^* \in V$ an x-squeezed tree and $\langle k_i : i \in \omega\rangle \in V$ such that for every $\eta \in {}^{<\omega}\omega$ we have $\eta \in T^*$ iff $(\forall n > 0)(\exists i < n)(\eta \restriction k_n \in S'_{k_i})$.

Build $\langle n'_i : i \in \omega\rangle$ an increasing sequence of integers such that $n'_0 = 0$ and $n'_1 > k_1$ and for every $i \in \omega$ we have $h(n'_i) < n'_{i+1}$ and

(*) $(\exists t \in \omega)(n'_i < k_t < n'_{i+1})$.

For every $i \in \omega$ let $m_i = h(n'_{3i+3})$.

Fix $\eta \in {}^{<\omega}\omega$ such that $(\forall i > 0)(\exists j < i)(\eta \restriction m_{i+1} \in T_{m_j})$. To establish the Lemma, it suffices to show $\eta \in T^*$. By choice of T^*, it suffices to show $(\forall n > 0)$ $(\exists i < n)(\eta \restriction k_n \in S'_{k_i})$.

Claim 1. $(\forall i > 0)(\exists j < i)(\eta \restriction n'_{i+1} \in S'_{n'_j})$.

Proof: The proof breaks into two cases.

Case 1: $i < 6$.

We have $n'_{i+1} \leq n'_6 \leq h(n'_6) = m_1$, and $\eta \restriction m_1 \in T_0$, so $\eta \restriction n'_{i+1} \in S'_0$.

Case 2: $i \geq 6$.

Fix $i^* > 0$ such that $3i^* + 3 \leq i \leq 3i^* + 5$.

We may fix $j^* < i^*$ such that $\eta \restriction m_{i^*+1} \in T_{m_{j^*}}$.

Now, we have

(*) $i + 1 \leq 3i^* + 6$ so

(**) $n'_{i+1} \leq h(n'_{3i^*+6}) = m_{i^*+1}$.

We also have

(***) $\eta \restriction m_{i^*+1} \in T_{m_{j^*}} \subseteq S'_{h(m_{j^*})}$.

By (**) and (***) we have

(****) $\eta \restriction n'_{i+1} \in S'_{h(m_{j^*})}$.

Note that

(*****) $h(m_{j^*)} = h(h(n'_{3j^*+3})) \leq n'_{3j^*+5} \leq n'_{3i^*+2} \leq n'_{i-1}$.

By (****) and (*****) we have $\eta \restriction n'_{i+1} \in S'_{h(m_{j^*})} \subseteq S'_{n'_{i-1}}$.

The Claim is established.

To complete the proof of the Lemma, suppose $i > 0$. We must show that there is $t < i$ such that $\eta \restriction k_i \in S'_{k_t}$.

Case 1: $k_{i-1} < n'_0$.

By (*) we have $n'_1 \geq k_i$. By Claim 1 we have $\eta \restriction n'_1 \in S_0$. Hence $\eta \restriction k_i \in S_0$.

Case 2: $n'_0 \leq k_{i-1}$.

By (*) we know that there is at most one element of $\{n'_j : j \in \omega\}$ strictly between k_{i-1} and k_i. Hence we may fix $j > 0$ such that $n'_{j-1} \leq k_{i-1} < k_i \leq n'_{j+1}$. If $\eta \restriction n'_{j+1} \in S_0$ then $\eta \restriction k_i \in S_0$ and we are done, so assume otherwise. By Claim 1 we may fix $m < j$ such that $\eta \restriction n'_{j+1} \in S'_{n'_m}$. We have $\eta \restriction k_i \in S'_{n'_m} \subseteq S'_{n'_{j-1}} \subseteq S'_{k_{i-1}}$ and again we are done.

The Lemma is established.

Lemma 7.15. *Suppose P is a forcing notion and $y \in {}^{\omega}(\omega - \{0\})$ is strictly increasing. Suppose $\langle T_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ is a sequence of y-squeezed trees. Then there is a y-squeezed tree T^* such that in $V[G_P]$ we have that for every $n \in \omega$ and every $j \in \omega$ and every $g \in [T_j]$ there is $k \in \omega$ such that for every $\eta \in T_j$ extending $g \restriction k$, if $\eta \restriction k \in T^*$ then $\eta \in T^*$.*

Proof: Build a sequence of y-squeezed trees $\langle T'_j : j \in \omega \rangle$ such that $T'_0 = T_0$

and for every $j \in \omega$ we have $T'_{j+1} = T'_j \cup T_{j+1}$. By Lemma 7.13 we may find an increasing sequence of integers $\langle k_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ and a y-squeezed tree T^* such that $k_0 = 0$ and $(\forall n > 0)(k_n > n)$ and for every $\eta \in {}^{<\omega}\omega$ we have

$$(\forall n > 0)(\exists i < n)(\eta \restriction k_n \in T'_{k_i}) \text{ iff } \eta \in T^*.$$

Fix a forcing notion P and work in $V[G_P]$. Fix $j \in \omega$ and $g \in [T_j]$. Let $k = \max\{k_{j'} : j' \leq j\}$. Fix $\eta \in T_j$ extending $g \restriction k$ and assume $\eta \restriction k \in T^*$. It suffices to show that $\eta \in T^*$. If $j = 0$ then $\eta \in T_0 = T'_0 \subseteq T^*$. Therefore, we assume that $j > 0$. It suffices to show that

$$(\forall i > 0)(\exists i' < i)(\eta \restriction k_i \in T'_{k_{i'}}).$$

Towards this end, fix $i > 0$.

Case 1: $i \leq j$.

Because $k_i \leq k$ we have $\eta \restriction k_i \in T^*$. Therefore we may take $i' < i$ such that $\eta \restriction k_i \in T'_{k_{i'}}$.

Case 2: $0 < j < i$.

Because $\eta \in T_j$ we have $\eta \restriction i \in T_j \subseteq T'_{j+1} \subseteq T'_{k_j}$.

The Lemma is established.

Lemma 7.16. *Suppose* $y \in {}^{\omega}(\omega - \{0\})$ *is strictly increasing. Suppose that for every* $n \in \omega$ *we have that* T_n *is a* y*-squeezed tree. Suppose* $\zeta \in {}^{\omega}\omega$. *Then there is a* y*-squeezed tree* $T^* \supseteq T$ *and a sequence of integers* $\langle m_i : i \in \omega \rangle$ *such that* $\zeta \in [T^*]$ *and for every* $i \in \omega$ *and every* $j > m_i$ *and every* $\nu \in T_{m_i}$ *extending* $\zeta \restriction j$ *we have* $\nu \in T^*$.

Proof. Define $\langle T'_k : k \in \omega \rangle$ by setting $T'_0 = T_0 \cup \{\zeta \restriction n : n \in \omega\}$ and for every $k \in \omega$ set $T'_{k+1} = T'_k \cup T_{k+1}$.

By Lemma 7.13 we may choose T^* a y-squeezed tree and $\langle m_i : i \in \omega \rangle$ an increasing sequence of integers such that

$$(\forall g \in {}^{\omega}\omega)((\forall n > 0)(\exists i < n)(g \restriction m_n \in T'_{m_i}) \text{ iff } g \in [T^*]).$$

Now suppose that $\eta \in T$ and $i \in \omega$ and $\mathrm{length}(\eta) \geq m_i$ and ν extends η and $\nu \in T_{m_i}$. We show $\nu \in T^*$.

Choose $h \in [T_{m_i}]$ extending ν. It suffices to show that $h \in [T^*]$. Therefore it suffices to show that $(\forall k > 0)(\exists j < k)(h \restriction m_k \in T'_{m_j})$.

Fix $k \in \omega$. If $i < k$ then because $h \in [T_{m_i}]$ we have that $h \restriction m_k \in T_{m_i} \subseteq T'_{m_i}$ and we are done. If instead $k \leq i$ then $h \restriction m_k = \eta \restriction m_k \in T'_0$ and again we are done.

The Lemma is established.

Theorem 7.17. *Suppose* $\langle P_\eta : \eta \le \kappa\rangle$ *is a countable support iteration based on* $\langle Q_\eta : \eta < \kappa\rangle$ *and suppose* $(\forall \eta < \kappa)(\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\eta}$ "Q_η is proper and has the P-point property"). *Suppose* λ *is a sufficiently large regular cardinal and* $\alpha < \kappa$ *and* y *is a* P_α*-name and* T *is a* P_κ*-name and* $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\alpha}$ "$y \in {}^\omega(\omega - \{0\})$ is strictly increasing" *and* $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\kappa}$ "T is a y-squeezed tree." *Suppose* N *is a countable elementary submodel of* H_λ *and* $\{P_\kappa, \alpha, y, T\} \in N$. *Suppose* $p \in P_\alpha$ *and* p *is* N*-generic. Then* $p \Vdash$ "$(\forall q \in P_{\alpha,\kappa})(\exists q' \le q)(\exists H)(H$ is a y-squeezed tree and $q' \Vdash$ '$T \subseteq H$')."

Proof: The proof proceeds by induction on κ. We assume that λ, N, α, p, y, and T are as in the hypothesis of the Theorem. Fix a P_α-name q in N such that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash$ "$q \in P_{\alpha,\kappa}$.

Case 1. $\kappa = \beta + 1$.

Using Lemma 7.12, choose $\tilde q$ and H' such that

$$\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\beta} \text{“}\tilde q \le q(\beta) \text{ and } H' \text{ is a } y\text{-squeezed tree and } \tilde q \Vdash \text{“}T \subseteq H'.\text{'”}$$

We may assume that the names $\tilde q$ and H' are elements of N. Use the induction hypothesis to take a P_α-names q^* and H such that

$$p \Vdash \text{“}q^* \le q\restriction\beta \text{ and } H \text{ is a } y\text{-squeezed tree and } q^* \Vdash \text{‘}H' \subseteq H.\text{'”}$$

We have that $p \Vdash$ "$(q^*, \tilde q) \Vdash$ '$T \subseteq H$.'"' Case 1 is established.

Case 2. $\mathrm{cf}(\kappa) > \omega$.

Because no ω-sequences of ordinals can be added at limit stages of uncountable cofinality, we may take β and T' and q' to be P_α-names in N such that

$$\begin{gathered}\mathbf{1} \Vdash \text{“}\alpha \le \beta < \kappa \text{ and } T' \text{ is a } P_{\alpha,\beta}\text{-name and } q' \le q \text{ and}\\ \mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_{\alpha,\beta}} \text{‘}T' \text{ is a } y\text{-squeezed tree' and } q' \Vdash_{P_{\alpha,\kappa}} \text{“}T' = T.\text{” '”}\end{gathered}$$

For every $\beta_0 \in \kappa \cap N$ such that $\alpha \le \beta_0$ let $\tilde q(\beta_0)$ and $H(\beta_0)$ be P_α-names in N such that

$$\begin{gathered}\mathbf{1} \Vdash \text{“if } \beta = \beta_0 \text{ and there is some } \tilde q \le q'\restriction\beta \text{ and some } H^*\\ \text{such that } H^* \text{ is a } y\text{-squeezed tree and } \tilde q \Vdash \text{‘}T' \subseteq H^*,\text{'}\\ \text{then } q^*(\beta_0) \text{ and } H(\beta_0) \text{ are witnesses thereto.”}\end{gathered}$$

Let q^* and H and s be P_α-names such that for every $\beta_0 \in \kappa \cap N$, if $\alpha \le \beta_0$, then

$$\mathbf{1} \Vdash \text{“if } \beta = \beta_0 \text{ then } q^* = q^*(\beta_0) \text{ and } H = H(\beta_0) \text{ and } s \in P_{\alpha,\kappa} \text{ and}$$

$$s\restriction\beta = q^* \text{ and } s\restriction[\beta,\kappa) = q'\restriction[\beta,\kappa).\text{''}$$

Claim 1: $p \Vdash$ "$s \leq q$ and $s \Vdash$ '$T \subseteq H$.' "

Proof: Suppose $p' \leq p$. Choose $p^* \leq p'$ and $\beta_0 < \kappa$ such that $p^* \Vdash$ "$\beta_0 = \beta$." Because the name β is in N and p^* is N-generic, we have that $\beta_0 \in N$. Notice by the induction hypothesis we have

$$p \Vdash \text{``there is some } q^\# \leq q'\restriction\beta_0 \text{ and some } y\text{-squeezed tree } H^\# \\ \text{such that } q^\# \Vdash \text{`}T' \subseteq H^\#.\text{' ''}$$

Hence

$$p^* \Vdash \text{``}q^* = q^*(\beta_0) \leq q'\restriction\beta \text{ and } H = H(\beta_0) \text{ and } H \text{ is a } y\text{-squeezed tree and} \\ q^* \Vdash \text{`}T' \subseteq H \text{ and } q'\restriction[\beta,\kappa) \Vdash \text{``}T' = T.\text{'' ' ''}$$

Therefore $p^* \Vdash$ "$s \Vdash$ '$T \subseteq H$.' "

Claim 1 is established. This completes Case 2.

Case 3. $\mathrm{cf}(\kappa) = \omega$.

Let $\langle \alpha_n : n \in \omega\rangle$ be an increasing sequence from $\kappa \cap N$ cofinal in κ such that $\alpha_0 = \alpha$.

By Theorem 3.3 we have that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\alpha}$ "$P_{\alpha,\kappa}$ is ω^ω-bounding," so we may fix P_α-names $\tilde{q}$ and h such that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\alpha}$ "$h \in {}^\omega\omega$ and $\tilde{q} \leq q$ and $\tilde{q} \Vdash_{P_{\alpha,\kappa}}$ 'T is h-tight.' " We may assume the names h and $\tilde{q}$ are in N.

Working in $V[G_{P_\alpha}]$, let z and $\langle \mathcal{T}_\beta : \beta \in \omega\rangle$ and $\mathcal{T}$ be as in the proof of Lemma 7.12. In $V[G_{P_\kappa}]$ let $\zeta \in [\mathcal{T}]$ be defined by $(\forall n \in \omega)(\zeta(n) = T \cap {}^{<h(n)}\omega)$. In $V[G_{P_\alpha}]$ fix an isomorphism from ${}^{<\omega}\omega$ onto $\mathcal{T}$ and implicitly fix a P_α-name for the isomorphism that is an element of N.

Using Lemma 3.1, fix $\langle (p_n, \zeta_n) : n \in \omega\rangle \in N$ (that is, the sequence of names is an element of N but not necessarily their values) such that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash$ "$p_0 \leq \tilde{q}$" and for every $n \in \omega$ we have that each of the following holds:

(0) p_n is a P_α-name for an element of $P_{\alpha,\kappa}$, and

(1) For every $k \leq n$ we have $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_{\alpha_n}}$ "$p_0\restriction[\alpha_n,\kappa) \Vdash$ '$\zeta\restriction k = \zeta_n\restriction k$,' " and

(2) ζ_n is a P_{α_n}-name for an element of $[\mathcal{T}]$, and

(3) $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_{\alpha_n}}$ "$p_0\restriction[\alpha_n,\alpha_{n+1}) \Vdash$ '$\zeta_n\restriction k = \zeta_{n+1}\restriction k$ for every $k \leq n+1$,' " and

(4) $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\alpha}$ "$p_{n+1} \leq p_n$," and

(5) whenever $k \leq m < \omega$ we have $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_{\alpha_n}}$ "$p_m\restriction[\alpha_n,\alpha_{n+1}) \Vdash$ '$\zeta_n\restriction k = \zeta_{n+1}\restriction k$.' "

Claim 2. Suppose $\alpha \leq \beta \leq \gamma < \kappa$ and suppose T' is a P_γ-name for a z-squeezed tree. Then

$$\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\beta} \text{“}V[G_{P_\alpha}] \models \text{‘}(\forall q \in P_{\beta,\gamma})(\exists q' \leq q)(\exists H)$$
$$(H \text{ is a } z\text{-squeezed tree and } q' \Vdash \text{“}T' \subseteq H\text{”}).\text{’”}$$

Proof: Given $r_1 \in P_\alpha$ and a P_α-name r_2 for an element of $P_{\alpha,\beta}$ and a P_β-name q for an element of $P_{\beta,\gamma} \cap V[G_{P_\alpha}]$, choose λ' a sufficiently large regular cardinal and N' a countable elementary substructure of $H_{\lambda'}$ containing $\{r_1, r_2, q, P_\kappa, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, z, T'\}$. Choose $r_1' \leq r_1$ such that r_1' is N'-generic. By the overall induction hypothesis (i.e., because $\gamma < \kappa$) we may choose s such that

$$r_1' \Vdash \text{“}s \leq (r_2, q) \text{ and } (\exists H)(H \text{ is a } z\text{-squeezed tree and } s \Vdash \text{‘}T' \subseteq H\text{’}).\text{”}$$

Consequently we may choose H such that

$$(r_1', s{\restriction}\beta) \Vdash \text{“}V[G_{P_\alpha}] \models \text{‘}s{\restriction}[\beta,\gamma) \leq q \text{ and } H \text{ is a } z\text{-squeezed tree and}$$
$$s{\restriction}[\beta,\gamma) \Vdash \text{“}T' \subseteq H\text{”}).\text{’”}$$

The Claim is established.

Let $\langle T_j' : j \in \omega\rangle$ list all P_α-names $T' \in N$ such that we have that T' is a z-squeezed tree.

Using Lemma 7.15, choose $T^* \supseteq T$ a z-squeezed tree such that, in $V[G_{P_\kappa}]$, we have that for every $n \in \omega$ and every $j \in \omega$ and every $g \in [T_j']$ there exists $k \in \omega$ such that for every $\eta \in T_j'$ extending $g{\restriction}k$, if $\eta{\restriction}k \in T^*$ then $\eta \in T^*$.

In the prceding paragraph, we worked in $V[G_{P_\kappa}]$ so that the brackets about T_j' would be interpreted in $V[G_{P_\kappa}]$; i.e., g net not be in $V[G_{P_\alpha}]$.

Claim 3. We may be build $\langle r_n : n \in \omega\rangle$ such that $r_0 = p$ and for every $n \in \omega$ we have that the following hold:

(1) $r_n \in P_{\alpha_n}$ is N-generic, and

(2) $r_{n+1}{\restriction}\alpha_n = r_n$, and

(3) $r_n \Vdash$ “$\zeta_n \in [T^*]$,” and

(4) $p \Vdash$ “$r_n{\restriction}[\alpha, \alpha_n) \leq p_0{\restriction}\alpha_n$.”

Proof: By induction on n. For $n = 0$ we have nothing to prove. Suppose we have r_n.

Usimg Claim 2, let F_0 and F_2 be P_{α_n}-names such that

$$(*)\quad \mathbf{1} \Vdash \text{“}F_0 \text{ and } F_2 \text{ are functions, both of which are in } V[G_{P_\alpha}],$$
$$\text{and each of whose domains is equal to } P_{\alpha_n,\alpha_{n+1}}, \text{ such that}$$
$$(\forall q' \in P_{\alpha_n,\alpha_{n+1}} \cap V[G_{P_\alpha}])(F_0(q') \subseteq \mathcal{T} \text{ is a } z\text{-squeezed tree}$$
$$\text{and } F_2(q') \leq q'$$
$$\text{and } F_2(q') \Vdash \text{‘}\zeta_{n+1} \in [F_0(q')]\text{’}).\text{”}$$

We may assume that the names F_0 and F_2 are in N. Notice that F_0 and F_2 depend on n, although this dependence is suppressed in our notation.

Working in $V[G_{P_{\alpha_n}}]$, use Lemma 7.16 to choose $\tilde{T}_n \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ a z-squeezed tree and $\langle k_i : i \in \omega\rangle$ an increasing sequence of integers (this sequence depends on n but this fact is suppressed in our notation) such that

if F_0 is a function in $V[G_{P_\alpha}]$ whose domains is equal to $P_{\alpha_n,\alpha_{n+1}}$, such that $(\forall q' \in P_{\alpha_n,\alpha_{n+1}} \cap V[G_{P_\alpha}])(F_0(q') \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ is a z-squeezed tree)

then $\zeta_n \in [\tilde{T}_n]$ and $\tilde{T}_n \in V[G_{P_\alpha}]$ and for every η and every $i \in \omega$ and every $\nu \in F_0(p_{k_i} \restriction [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}))$, if η is a proper initial segment of ζ_n and length$(\eta) \geq k_i$ and ν extends η, then $\nu \in \tilde{T}_n$.

We may assume the P_{α_n}-name $\tilde{T}_n$ is in N.

By (*) we have that

$$\begin{gathered} r_n \Vdash \text{“}\zeta_n \in [\tilde{T}_n] \text{ and for every } \eta \text{ and every } i \in \omega \\ \text{and every } \nu \in F_0(p_{k_i} \restriction [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1})), \\ \text{if } \eta \text{ is a proper initial segment of } \zeta_n \text{ and} \\ \text{length}(\eta) \geq k_i \text{ and } \nu \text{ extends } \eta \text{ then } \nu \in \tilde{T}_n.\text{”} \end{gathered}$$

Because $\tilde{T}_n$ is a P_{α_n}-name in N forced to be in $V[G_{P_\alpha}]$, we conclude that by the N-genericity of r_n that

$$r_n \Vdash \text{“}\tilde{T}_n \in N[G_{P_\alpha}].\text{”}$$

Therefore there is a P_{α_n}-name m such that

$$r_n \Vdash \text{“}\tilde{T}_n = T'_m.\text{”}$$

Because T^* was chosen as in the conclusion of Lemma 7.15, we may choose k to be a P_{α_n}-name for an integer such that

(**) $r_n \Vdash$ “$(\forall \eta \in \tilde{T}_n)$(if η extends $\zeta_n \restriction k$ and $\eta \restriction k \in T^*$ then $\eta \in T^*$).”

Choose j and K to be P_{α_n}-names for integers such that $r_n \Vdash$ “$K = k_j \geq k$.”

Subclaim 1. $r_n \Vdash$ “$F_2(p_K \restriction [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1})) \Vdash$ ‘$\zeta_{n+1} \in [\tilde{T}_n]$.’ ”

Proof. It suffices to show

$r_n \Vdash$ “$F_2(p_K \restriction [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1})) \Vdash$ ‘$(\forall \nu)$(if ν is a proper initial segment of ζ_{n+1} and lh$(\nu) \geq K$ then $\nu \in \tilde{T}_n$).’ ”

Fix ν and η such that

$r_n \Vdash$ "$F_2(p_K \restriction [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1})) \Vdash$ '$\nu \in T_{n+1}$ and $\mathrm{lh}(\nu) \geq K$ and $\eta = \nu \restriction K$.' "

By the definition of $\langle p_i : i \in \omega\rangle$ we have

(***) $r_n \Vdash$ "$p_K \restriction [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}) \Vdash$ 'η is an initial segment of ζ_{n+1}.' "

By (*) we have

(****) $r_n \Vdash$ "$F_2(p_K \restriction [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1})) \Vdash$ 'ν is an initial segment of ζ_{n+1} and $\zeta_{n+1} \in [F_0(p_K \restriction [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}))]$.' "

Combining (***), (****), the definition of $\tilde{T}_n$ and the fact that $r_n \Vdash$ "$K \in \{k_i : i \in \omega\}$," we have that

$$r_n \Vdash \text{“}F_2(p_K \restriction [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1})) \Vdash \text{‘}\nu \in \tilde{T}_n.\text{’ ”}$$

The Subclaim is established.

Subclaim 2. $r_n \Vdash$ "$F_2(p_K \restriction [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1})) \Vdash$ '$\zeta_{n+1} \in [T^*]$.' "

Proof: By (**) we have

(†) $r_n \Vdash$ "$(\forall \eta \in \tilde{T}_n)(\eta \restriction K \in T^*$ implies $\eta \in T^*)$."

Work in $V[G_{P_{\alpha_n}}]$ with $r_n \in G_{P_{\alpha_n}}$. Fix $\eta \in \tilde{T}_n$ and suppose $F_2(p_K \restriction [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1})) \Vdash$ "η is an initial segment of ζ_{n+1} and $\mathrm{lh}(\eta) \geq K$." To establish the Subclaim it suffices to show

(#) $F_2(p_K \restriction [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1})) \Vdash$ "$\eta \in T^*$."

By the definition of $\langle p_i : i \in \omega\rangle$ we have

$$p_K \restriction [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}) \Vdash \text{“}\eta \restriction K = \zeta_n \restriction K.\text{”}$$

Hence by the fact that Claim 3 holds for the integer n we have

(††) $p_K \restriction [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1})) \Vdash$ "$\eta \restriction K \in T^*$."

By Subclaim 1, (†), (††), and the fact that $F_2(p_K \restriction [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1})) \leq p_K \restriction [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1})$ we obtain

$$F_2(p_K \restriction \alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1})) \Vdash \text{“}\eta \in T^*.\text{”}$$

Subclaim 2 is established.

To complete the induction establishing Claim 3, we use the Proper Iteration Lemma to take $r_{n+1} \in P_{\alpha_{n+1}}$ such that $r_{n+1} \restriction \alpha_n = r_n$ and r_{n+1} is N-generic and $r_n \Vdash$ "$r_{n+1} \restriction [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}) \leq F_2(p_K \restriction [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}))$."

Claim 3 is established.

Let q' be a P_α-name such that

$$p \Vdash \text{“}q' = \bigcup\{r_n \restriction [\alpha, \alpha_n) : n \in \omega\}.\text{”}$$

In $V[G_{P_\alpha}]$, let $H^* = \bigcup T^*$ and let

$$H = \{\nu \in H^* : (\forall n \in \omega)(\exists \eta \in H^*)(\nu \text{ is comparable with } \eta)\}.$$

As in the proof of Lemma 7.12, we have that H is a z-squeezed tree. By Claim 3 we have that

$$q' \Vdash \text{“for every } n \in \omega \text{ we have } \zeta_n \in [T^*] \text{ and } \zeta_n \restriction n = \zeta \restriction n,$$
$$\text{and therefore } \zeta \in [T^*], \text{ and therefore } T \subseteq H.\text{”}$$

The Theorem is established.

Corollary 7.18. *Suppose* $\langle P_\eta : \eta \leq \kappa \rangle$ *is a countable support iteration based on* $\langle Q_\eta : \eta < \kappa \rangle$ *and suppose that for every* $\eta < \kappa$ *we have that* $\mathbf{1} \Vdash$ “Q_η is proper and has the P-point property.” *Then* P_κ *has the* P*-point property.*

Proof: By Theorem 7.17 with $\alpha = 0$.

8 On adding no Cohen reals

In [12, Conclusion VI.2.13D(1)], Shelah states that a countable support iteration of proper forcings, each of which adds no Cohen reals, either adds no Cohen reals or adds a dominating real. However, according to Jakob Kellner, Shelah has stated that this is an error, and the result holds only at limit stages. In this section, we prove the limit case.

Definition 8.1. *A nowhere dense tree* $T \subseteq {}^{<\omega}\omega$ *is a non-empty tree such that for every* $\eta \in T$ *there is some* ν *extending* η *such that* $\nu \notin T$*. A perfect tree* $T \subseteq {}^{<\omega}\omega$ *is a non-empty tree such that for every* $\eta \in T$*, the set of successors of* η *in* T *is not linearly ordered.*

Lemma 8.2. P *does not add any Cohen reals iff* $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_P$ “$(\forall f \in {}^\omega\omega)(\exists H \in V)$ (H is a nowhere dense perfect tree and $f \in [H]$).”

Proof: This is a tautological consequence of the definition of Cohen real.

Lemma 8.3. *Suppose* $\mathrm{cf}(\kappa) = \omega$ *and* $\langle P_\eta : \eta \leq \kappa \rangle$ *is a countable support forcing iteration. Suppose* $(\forall \eta < \kappa)$(P_η does not add any Cohen reals) *and* $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\kappa}$ “for every countable $x \subseteq V$ there is a countable $y \in V$ such that $x \subseteq y$.” *Suppose P_κ does not add any dominating reals. Then P_κ does not add any Cohen reals.*

Proof. Fix $\langle \alpha_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ cofinal in κ with $\alpha_0 = 0$. Also in $V[G_{P_\kappa}]$ fix $\zeta \in {}^{\omega}\omega$. Use Lemma 3.1 to construct $\langle p_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ and $\langle \zeta_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ as there. In particular for every $n \in \omega$ we have $p_0 \Vdash_{P_\kappa}$ “$\zeta_n \restriction n = \zeta \restriction n$ and $\zeta_n \in {}^{\omega}\omega \cap V[G_{P_{\alpha_n}}]$.”

Working in $V[G_{P_\kappa}]$ with $p_0 \in G_{P_\kappa}$, use the fact that for every $n \in \omega$ we have that P_{α_n} does not add Cohen reals, let $\langle T_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ be a sequence of nowhere dense perfect trees such that $(\forall n \in \omega)(T_n \in V$ and $\zeta_n \in [T_n])$.

Let $B \in V$ be a countable set of nowhere dense perfect trees such that for every $n \in \omega$ we have $T_n \in B$. Let $\langle S_n : n \in \omega \rangle \in V$ enumerate B with infinitely many repetitions such that $T_0 = S_0$.

Build inductively $\langle S'_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ such that $S'_{n+1} = S_{n+1} \cup S'_n$ and $S'_0 = S_0$.

Define $h \in {}^{\omega}\omega$ by setting $h(k)$ equal to the least $m > k$ such that $T_k \subseteq S'_m$, for every $k \in \omega$. Because P_κ adds no dominating reals we may choose $g \in {}^{\omega}\omega \cap V$ and $A \subseteq \omega$ such that $A = \{n \in \omega : g(n) > h(n)\}$ and A is infinite.

Choose $\langle k_i : i \in \omega \rangle \in V$ an increasing sequence of integers as follows. Let $k_0 = 0$. Given k_n, choose $k_{n+1} \geq \max(k_n + 1, 2)$ such that $(\forall \nu \in {}^{\leq k_n}k_n)$ $[(\exists \nu' \in {}^{k_{n+1}}\omega$ extending $\nu)(\forall i \leq k_n)(\nu' \notin S'_{g(i)})$ and $(\forall i \leq k_n)(\exists \nu_1 \in S'_{g(i)})$ $(\exists \nu_2 \in S'_{g(i)})(\nu_1$ and ν_2 are distinct extensions of ν and $\mathrm{lh}(\nu_1) = \mathrm{lh}(\nu_2) = k_{n+1})]$.

Let $T^0 = \{\eta \in {}^{<\omega}\omega : (\exists s \in \omega)(\exists j \in \omega)(k_{2s} \leq j < k_{2s+1}$ and $\eta \restriction j \in S'_0$ and $\eta \in S'_{g(j)})\}$.

Let $T^1 = \{\eta \in {}^{<\omega}\omega : (\exists s \in \omega)(\exists j \in \omega)(k_{2s+1} \leq j < k_{2s+2}$ and $\eta \restriction j \in S'_0$ and $\eta \in S'_{g(j)})\}$.

Claim 1: T^0 is a nowhere dense tree.

Proof. Suppose $\eta \in T^0$. Choose s and j witnessing this. Also take $n \geq s$ so large that $\eta \in {}^{\leq k_{2n}}k_{2n}$.

We choose ν extending η such that $\mathrm{lh}(\nu) = k_{2n+2}$ and $(\forall i \leq k_{2n+1})(\nu \notin S'_{g(i)})$. In particular we have $\nu \notin S'_0$. We show that $\nu \notin T^0$. So suppose, towards a contradiction, that $s' \in \omega$ and $j' \in \omega$ and $k_{2s'} \leq j' < k_{2s'+1}$ and $\nu \restriction j' \in S'_0$ and $\nu \in S'_{g(j')}$. Because $\nu \in S'_{g(j')}$ we know $j' \geq k_{2n+1}$. Necessarily, then, $j' \geq k_{2n+2}$. But then $\nu = \nu \restriction j' \in S'_0$. This contradiction establishes the Claim.

Claim 2. T^0 is a perfect tree.

Proof: Given $\eta \in T^0$, let $s \in \omega$ and $j \in \omega$ be witnesses.

Case 1: $\mathrm{lh}(\eta) \geq j$.

Let ν and ν' be incomparable elements of $S'_{g(j)}$ extending η. We have that ν and ν' are in T^0; this is witnessed by the integers s and j.

Case 2: $\mathrm{lh}(\eta) < j$.

Take ν and ν' distinct extensions of η such that $\nu \in S_0$ and $\nu' \in S_0$ and $\mathrm{lh}(\nu) = \mathrm{lh}(\nu') = j$. We have $\nu \in S'_{g(j)}$ and $\nu' \in S'_{g(j)}$ because $S_0 \subseteq S'_{g(j)}$. We have that ν and ν' are in T^0; this is witnessed by the integers s and j.

Claim 3: T^1 is a nowhere dense perfect tree.

Proof: Similar to Claims 1 and 2.

Let $B_0 = \bigcup\{[k_{2i}, k_{2i+1}) : i \in \omega\}$ and let $B_1 = \bigcup\{[k_{2i+1}, k_{2i+2}) : i \in \omega\}$.

Claim 4: $(\forall n \in A \cap B_0)(\zeta_n \in [T^0])$.

Proof: Given $n \in A \cap B_0$ choose $s \in \omega$ such that $k_{2s} \leq n < k_{2s+1}$. We have $\zeta_n \in [T_n] \subseteq [S'_{h(n)}] \subseteq [S'_{g(n)}]$ and $\zeta_n \restriction n \in S'_0$. Hence $\zeta_n \in [T^0]$. The Claim is established.

Claim 5: $(\forall n \in A \cap B_1)(\zeta_n \in [T^1])$.

Proof: Similar to Claim 4.

We have that T^0 and T^1 are elements of V. Furthermore, if $A \cap B_0$ is infinite, we have by Claim 4 that for infinitely many n we have $\zeta_n \in [T^0]$) and hence $\zeta \in [T^0]$. Otherwise by Claim 5 it follows that for infinitely many n we have $\zeta_n \in [T^1]$ and hence $\zeta \in [T^1]$. The Lemma is established.

9 On not adding reals not belonging to any null sets of V

In this section we give Shelah's proof that the property "P does not add any real not belonging to any closed set of measure zero of the ground model" is preserved at limit stages by countable support iterations of proper forcings assuming the iteration does not add dominating reals.

Theorem 9.1. *Suppose $\langle P_\eta : \eta \leq \kappa\rangle$ is a countable support iteration based on $\langle Q_\eta : \eta < \kappa\rangle$ and suppose κ is a limit ordinal and* $(\forall\eta < \kappa)(P_\eta$ does not add reals not in any closed measure zero set of $V)$. *Suppose also that P_κ does not add any dominating reals. Then P_κ does not add any real not in any closed measure zero set of V.*

Proof: Repeat the proof of Theorem 8.3 with "nowhere dense perfect tree" replace by "perfect tree with Lebesgue measure zero" throughout.

Refernces

[1] Todd Eisworth, CH and first countable, countably compact spaces, Topology Appl. 109, no. 1, 55-73 (2001)

[2] Goldstern, M., Tools for Your Forcing Construction, Set theory of the reals (Haim Judah, editor), Israel Mathematical Conference Proceedings, vol. 6, American Mathematical Society, pp. 305–360. (1993)

[3] Goldstern, M. and J. Kellner, New reals: Can live with them, can live without them, Math. Log. Quart. 52, No. 2, pp. 115–124 (2006)

[4] Kellner J., and S. Shelah, Preserving preservation, Journal of Symbolic Logic, vol 70, pp. 914–945 (2005)

[5] Schlindwein, C., Consistency of Suslin's hypothesis, a non-special Aronszajn tree, and GCH, Journal of Symbolic Logic, vol. 59, pp. 1–29, 1994

[6] Schlindwein, C., Suslin's hypothesis does not imply stationary antichains, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic, vol. 64, pp. 153–167, 1993

[7] Schlindwein, C., Special non-special $\aleph_1$-trees, Set theory and its Applications, J. Steprans and S. Watson (eds.), Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1401, Springer-Verlag, 1989

[8] Schlindwein, C., A short proof of the preservation of the ω^ω-bounding property, Mathematical Logic Quarterly, vol. 50, pp. 19–32, 2004

[9] Schlindwein, C., Shelah's work on non-semi-proper iterations, II, Journal of Symbolic Logic, 2001

[10] Schlindwein, C., SH plus CH does not imply stationary antichains, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic, vol. 124, pp. 233–265, 2003

[11] Schlindwein, C., Shelah's work on non-semi-proper iterations, I, Archive for Mathematical Logic.

[12] Shelah, S., **Proper and Improper Forcing**, Perspectives in Mathematical Logic, Springer, Berlin, 1998